

IS

THE SYSTEM OF SLAVERY

SANCTIONED OR CONDEMNED

BY

SCRIPTURE ?

TO WHICH IS SUBJOINED

AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

TWO ESSAYS

UPON THE STATE OF THE CANAANITE AND PHILISTINE

BONDSMEN,

UNDER THE

JEWISH THEOCRACY.

Search the Scriptures, whether these things are so.—*Acts*, xvii. 11.

If ye *know* these things, happy are ye if ye *do* them.—*John*, xiii. 17.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JOHN AND ARTHUR ARCH, CORNHILL.

1824.

TO

THE CONSIDERATION OF

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,

AND THE OTHER CONSCIENTIOUS OPPOSERS OF

COLONIAL SLAVERY,

AND TO

BENEVOLENT WEST INDIA PROPRIETORS,

WHO

CONSCIENTIOUSLY DEFEND IT,

THESE PAGES ARE

RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION - - - - -	1
CHAP. I. Inhabitants of Palestine - - - - -	1
CHAP. II. Servitude in Judæa - - - - -	7
CHAP. III. Species of Servants - - - - -	8
CHAP. IV. Hired Servants - - - - -	8
CHAP. V. Purchased Servants - - - - -	13
CHAP. VI. Religious Privileges of Servants - - - - -	40
CHAP. VII. Summary - - - - -	42
CHAP. VIII. Conclusion - - - - -	42

APPENDIX.

INTRODUCTION - - - - -	51
ESSAY I. Sketch of the History of the Philistines and Canaanites - - - - -	53
ESSAY II. State of the Philistines and Canaanites under the Jewish Theocracy - - - - -	78

MEMORANDA FOR THE READER.

OBSERVE, when the verses quoted from Scripture are divided by commas only, the individual verses numbered are intended; but, when they are connected by a hyphen, a reference is made, not only to the two verses at each extremity of the hyphen, but also to the whole intervening passage.

Thus, Matt. v. 1, 12, 16, means, St. Matthew's Gospel, the fifth chapter, 1st, 12th, and 16th verses.

Matt. v. 1—16, stands for St. Matthew's Gospel, fifth chapter, from the 1st to the end of the 16th verse, inclusive.

Matt. v. 1, 12—16, signifies the fifth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, the 1st verse, and from the beginning of the twelfth verse, on to the end of the sixteenth.

The quotations from the Targums are mostly extracted from Dr. Gill's commentaries on the passages; and his references given.

The reader is apprized, that in many instances it is necessary to turn to the whole of the references given, on any point.

THE SYSTEM OF SLAVERY

SANCTIONED OR CONDEMNED

BY

SCRIPTURE?

INTRODUCTION.

FRIENDS to the Colonial System frequently defend slavery, upon the ground of its being sanctioned by Scripture. The Abolitionists, on the other hand, contend, that the system of servitude authorised amongst the Hebrews was totally dissimilar from that practised in the West Indies.

Friends to truth will prefer ascertaining facts to hazarding vague assertions.

We invite all such to search the Scriptures, in order to form a correct idea of the real state of that servitude, so differently described by opposite parties.

CHAPTER I.

INHABITANTS OF PALESTINE.

IN order to form a clear idea of the condition of slavery in Judæa, it is necessary previously to become acquainted with the people.

The inhabitants of Palestine consisted, under the Jewish theocracy, of two classes of persons, who, though

equally under the protection of the civil law, and equally invited to the worship of the one true God, were yet totally distinct as to their political privileges and their religious observances.

The first were the **HEBREWS**; under which term we comprehend all persons, either derived from the original stock of Israel, or engrafted into it by the rites of proselytism. These persons were the lords of the soil, and were alone eligible to the post of supreme rule, either in the state, tribe, or city. They were the only landholders; and hence their occupation was chiefly agriculture: they, in times of war, formed the militia of which the Jewish army was composed. Being all members of the Jewish covenant, either by birth or proselytism, they were bound by all the obligations, and entitled to all the privileges, of the Mosaic law.

The second class were the **STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES, OR BONDSMEN, OR BONDSERVANTS**; for all these terms were alike applied to them. These were the remnants of the seven nations of the Canaanites, and of the five lordships of the Philistines, whom Joshua conquered: they were, by the Divine law, dispossessed of any right or inheritance in the land, when Joshua by the command of God divided the whole soil by lot amongst the twelve tribes, and rendered the possessions of each unalienable. Though deprived of any interest in the soil, they still resided by sufferance in the land, on condition of paying a certain annual tribute to the Jewish government; or of redeeming it, if poor, by a stipulated quota of labour or service in public works. They were termed **BONDSMEN, OR BONDSERVANTS**, probably from the circumstance of being bound either to pay a certain sum or perform a stated service. They were probably denominated **STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES** from the circumstance of having no share in the soil, which led them chiefly to dwell in cities, which were always fenced with walls and gates; and within the verge of which alone

houses might be sold in perpetuity, without right of redemption from the lords of the soil. There they appear to have chiefly occupied themselves in merchandise, in works of art, in architecture, metallurgy, working in steel, cutlery, or goldsmiths' work, and in various species of handicraft labour. The magnificent structure of Solomon's Temple was the fruit of the industry and skill of the seven Canaanitish nations — of STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES. The poorer bondsmen did not, like the poor HEBREWS, hire themselves out as agricultural servants, but as porters, hewers of wood, drawers of water, and menial or personal servants. The STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES, whilst they remained such, that is, before they became Hebrew proselytes, were precluded from participating in the passover and other rites of the Jewish church, or entering the temple beyond the court of the Gentiles; but they were invited to all the religious privileges of Gentiles, who, forsaking idolatry, know and worship the one true GOD. Their sedulous instruction in the law of GOD was abundantly provided for and enforced. They were invited to worship at the temple, in the court of the Gentiles, and to offer their sacrifices there to JEHOVAH. They were also invited to attend several of the festivals. The rests of the sabbath, of the sabbatical year, and of the jubilee, were equally assured to them, and enforced *upon* them.

Idolatry, blasphemy, and eating blood, were equally forbidden, under pain of death, to both classes. In every other respect, excepting in circumstances arising from the distinction of the Hebrew being within the pale of the peculiar Jewish covenant, and being lords of the soil, they appear to have been perfectly equal. There was one law to the HEBREW and to the STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES. There were rich individuals of both societies, and there were poor members belonging to both. There were servants of each, and masters of each. The BONDSMAN OR BONDSERVANT, OR STRANGER WITHIN

THE GATES, was simply so denominated from being subject in the single article of tribute, or furnishing a quota of service from which the Hebrew was free; and sojourning in a land in whose soil he could acquire no property. In every other respect, both classes were equally free; and individuals belonging to both were equally liable, from the same cause, to forfeit their liberty. The Hebrew might become a slave to the opulent stranger, as well as the stranger to the opulent Hebrew.

It is absolutely necessary to the understanding of Jewish servitude, to bear in mind, that the distinction of HEBREW, and that of BONDSMEN, OR STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES, implies no signification in the least analogous to *free*, in opposition to *enslaved*; but that it simply indicates lords of the soil, within the pale of the Mosaic covenant — in contradistinction to tributaries, without the pale of that peculiar covenant.

Both the abilities and disabilities involved in this grand distinction, attached, not to the peculiar condition in life of the individuals of which each class was composed; they referred not to their riches or poverty, their freedom or slavery; but they equally affected all the members of each class, however various and dissimilar their condition might be in other respects.*

Every Hebrew was entitled to his share in the land, and to his religious privileges, whether in opulence or penury, in servitude or freedom. Every stranger was

* The condition of the STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES under the Jewish theocracy might not be unaptly explained, by comparing it to that of the Jew or the Catholic, under the dominant church in this nation. The Catholic nobleman, or opulent Jewish merchant, though perhaps possessing a hundred servants of the English church, yet labours under legal disabilities in point of offices in the state or the purchase of land, from which the lowest shoeblack or scullion in their establishment is free. In our own times and country, the distinction would be the civil privilege of a native, which qualifies him for public offices and holding lands, from which a foreigner is precluded.

incapacitated from possessing a landed freehold and a dominant office in the legislature, and was subjected to a tribute, however opulent or exalted in office he might be in other respects.

I am aware that this is not the opinion usually entertained. It has been generally supposed that the wars of the Jews in Canaan were wars of extermination; and that the few who escaped the general massacre were stripped of all their property, and reduced to a condition of base, abject, and hopeless personal slavery, much resembling that of our West India field-slaves. This notion is, however, entirely mistaken: and we must consider the mistake as most important, because it has been the means of perplexing the views of many respecting the Divine character; it has also given most false views of the state of Jewish servitude. Yet as a generally-received opinion is not to be combated by unsupported assertions, but to be refuted by substantial evidence of proof, I have thought it best to enter fully into the subject in two chapters; one on the history of the Philistines and Canaanites, and the other containing a full account of the laws to which they were subject under the Jewish theocracy. I trust the scriptural proof there adduced will fully shew the prevalent opinion of the extermination of the bulk of the Canaanitish nation, and that of the reduction of the remnant to slavery, to be entirely grounded on misapprehension. But as the full elucidation this subject demands would form too long a parenthesis in the prosecution of the main object of inquiry, and as many may already be satisfied upon that point, it has been referred to the APPENDIX.

That the reader, already convinced by his own scriptural inquiries, may not be compelled to travel over the same ground again; and that the impartial inquirer who has not considered the subject before, may have an opportunity of seeing a full statement of that Scripture evidence, on which the dissent from the usually received

opinion is founded—to the latter it is recommended that the Appendix be read as a preliminary discourse, previously to entering upon the next chapter; since it is absolutely necessary that this subject be clearly understood, before the reader can proceed on his inquiry on the state of servitude amongst the Jews.

In the following pages, the term **PALESTINE** will be used to denote that tract of land termed the Holy Land, in every stage of its political existence; whether under the Philistines (from whom it borrowed that name, as it also adopted that of Canaan from the Canaanites,) or under the Jews, or Romans, or present possessors.

The name **JUDÆA** will be applied, not exclusively to the province known by that name, in contradistinction to Galilee and Samaria, but to the whole land of Palestine, as subsisting under the **JEWISH** theocracy and government.

The denomination **ISRAELITE** will be used to distinguish those persons exclusively who are descended of the stock of Abraham. That of **JEWISH PROSELYTE** will specify those who, being originally of the **STRANGERS**, have joined the Jewish church, by submitting to the three initiatory rites of circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. It will be necessary to distinguish carefully between this term and that of **GENTILE PROSELYTE**; by which we shall hereafter designate those persons who are proselytes from idolatry to the worship of **JEHOVAH**, and to the seven precepts of the moral law, but who do not enter the Mosaic covenant, and are consequently without the pale of Jewish privileges and observances.

The term **HEBREW** is here used as including both **ISRAELITES** and **JEWISH PROSELYTES**; all, in short, who are within the pale of Judaism.

The appellation **STRANGER WITHIN THE GATES**, or that of **BONDSMEN**, and **BONDSERVANTS**, will be used to denote the Philistines or Canaanites who dwelt in Judæa, and enjoyed the privileges of the court of the Gentiles and

the protection of the Jewish law, on condition of paying a certain quota of labour in public works.

These terms are here defined, to prevent the endless repetition of explanations in the body of the work ; they must be thoroughly understood, to prevent inextricable confusion.

Having defined the two grand classes of its inhabitants, we now proceed to make a few observations on the state of servitude, in general, in Judæa.

CHAPTER II.

OF SERVITUDE IN JUDÆA.

SERVITUDE was, in Judæa, always either voluntary or else inflicted as a judicial punishment.

In either case it was temporary.

It was always cancelled by gross ill-usage.

It recognised marriage as indissoluble, excepting the parties themselves wished a divorce. It hence considered the parties as indivisible by the master, both in their purchase and their manumission.

The civil and religious privileges of each class of the inhabitants of Judæa were equally assured to them, whether servants or free men.

The Hebrew master was obliged, by the Mosaic law, to give a diligent attention to the moral and religious instruction of all his servants, whether of the Hebrews or the strangers : the exercise of which was not left to the option of the master ; but the opportunities, the seasons, and the methods of which, were specified and particularized in the Divine law.

We now proceed to an inquiry into the various species of servitude under the Jewish theocracy ; and we trust that the detailed account of the laws of each will fully establish the above points. It is proposed to prove

every assertion by its appropriate Scripture reference, that the reader may be himself enabled to form a just estimate of the evidence upon which each one rests.

Whilst, however, Scripture will be cited as alone decisive with respect to the Divine law on the subject, we shall yet occasionally subjoin quotations, selected by esteemed biblical commentators, from some of the most esteemed targums, and other writings of celebrated Mishnic doctors, in order to shew the sense in which the text was actually received and understood by the Jews themselves.

These will be placed below, amongst the notes at the foot of the page; in order that they may by no possibility be confounded with the paramount authority of the sacred oracles of Divine truth themselves.

CHAPTER III.

SPECIES OF SERVANTS.

SERVANTS were, amongst the Jews, of two sorts; hired servants, see Exod. xii. 45; Lev. xxii. 10; xxv. 40 and 53; Deut. xv. 18; &c.—and purchased servants, or *what we term slaves*: see Lev. xxii. 11; Gen. xvii. 23 and 27; Exod. xii. 44; Lev. xxv. 39, 44, 45, 47—51.

We will consider the laws applying to each.

CHAPTER IV.

HIRED SERVANTS.

SERVANTS might be hired, either from amongst the Hebrews, or from amongst the strangers: Deuteronomy, xxiv. 14.

Hired servants appear to have been, amongst the Hebrews, the most inferior class of domestics; hence the

repentant Prodigal exclaims, "*How many HIRED servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger!*" Luke, xv. 17. And again, when he means emphatically to mark the very deepest humiliation, he purposes saying to his father, "*Make me as one of thy HIRED servants.*" Luke, xv. 19. Accordingly, a purchased servant is, in Deut. xv. 18, estimated at double the value of a hired one.

Servants were generally hired from the very poorest and least instructed classes. This is evident, by comparing the occupations of hired servants, in every instance mentioned in Scripture, with those of purchased domestics; but whether they were of the Hebrews or the strangers, it was equally forbidden to oppress them. Deut. xxiv. 14; Mal. iii. 5.

The hired servants appear to have much resembled our labourers, and inferior mechanics; and to have consisted of a class who did not possess sufficient skill or education to enable them to rank amongst purchased servants, who always formed a part of their master's household, and partook of his fare: whereas the hired servant lived at his own house, and provided himself.

Thus we find hired servants to be chiefly agricultural servants. We are informed, 2 Kings, xxv. 12, that "*the poor of the land were left,*" at the Babylonish captivity, "*to be vinedressers and husbandmen;*" Jer. xl. 10, lii. 16—see Matt. xx. 7; or shepherds, John, x. 11, 12, 13; or fishermen servants, Mark, i. 20. As we find throughout Scripture that the different condition of the Hebrews and strangers occasioned the first to be chiefly employed in agriculture, and the last in handicraft labour, so it seems probable that the same division of labour would pervade their hired services. The Hebrew's previous occupations would fit him for an agricultural servant; and the stranger's, whose bond service consisted of hewing wood and drawing water, Josh. ix. 23, and of bearing burthens, hewing timber, and working in gold, and in silver, in

brass, in iron, and in purple, and in crimson, and in blue, (see 2 Chron. ii. 17, 18, and ii. 2—7,) and in cutting and polishing marble, and carving wood, (see 1 Kings, v. 13—18, *compared with the account given by Josephus of Solomon's temple*)—must in every probability have hired himself as a servant, in employments of the like nature. This opinion is corroborated, when we consider the little skill of the Israelites in occupations of this description. Thus we find, 1 Samuel, xiii. 19, 20, not eighty years before the building of the Temple, that there was no smith to be found throughout all Israel: but “*all the Israelites went down to the Philistines, to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his axe, and his mattock.*”

However this may be, the hired servants appear to have been of the lowest description. The Unjust Steward appears to have been a purchased servant, and consequently superior in rank and education to a hired one, and therefore incapable of the drudgery and severe labour which usually fell to their lot. We find him, Luke, xvi. 3, reasoning within himself, “*What shall I do? I cannot dig,*” (the occupation of a Hebrew hired servant,) “*to beg I am ashamed.*”

Servants hired themselves, as in the present day, for various portions of time, at their own pleasure: either by the day, Matt. xx. 2, and Job, vii. 1, 2; or by the year, Lev. xxv. 53, and Isaiah, xxi. 16. It appears probable, that in some kinds of services, they were even hired for three years, which seems not to have been uncommon; see Dent. xv. 18, compared with Isaiah, xvi. 14.

Servants hired themselves by standing in the marketplace, early in the morning, Matt. xx. 3,* Matt. xx. 1—13.

* Iarchi says there was a peculiar part of the market, paved on purpose, upon which they stood. He observes, hired servants and purchased servants are not used amongst the Hebrews as they are

It appears from the parable, Matt. xx. 9—12, that their hours of labour were until six in the evening, and that their wages were one denarius per day, Matt. xx. 2.

These wages, however low they may appear to us, were probably abundantly sufficient to provide the mere necessities of life. For the Prodigal Son, whilst he mentions hired servants, as of the very lowest species, yet immediately adds, "*they have bread enough and to spare.*" Luke, xv. 17. Again, we find the Good Samaritan giving two denarii, that is, a sum equal to two days' wages, to the landlord of the caravansera, to repay him for his care of the wounded traveller; Luke, x. 35. Now if we bear in mind that in every Oriental country, the trouble, both of providing food and of dressing it, invariably falls to the share, not of the host, but of his inmate, it is obvious that this sum of fifteen English pence, small as it may seem to us, must have been adequate to pay the traveller's lodging, medicine, and food, together with all the extra trouble of providing all these things, and waiting upon him—since we find he was so severely wounded as to be incapable either of standing or walking: "*He was left by the thieves half dead,*" Luke, x. 30, and his benefactor was obliged to take him on his own beast to the inn, and take care of him the first night, Luke, x. 34, 35.

With the stipend of one denarius per day, it seems then that hired servants sufficiently supplied all their necessities: but they were not provided for in the comfortable, nay in the almost luxurious way which, we shall hereafter see, fell not unfrequently to the share of the purchased servant.

In order then that hired servants, who had to provide both for themselves and their families, might never be

elsewhere, and tied to the stone pillar in the market like cattle for sale. The Hebrew servants shall be parted with by private contract; and as for the hired ones, they shall stand voluntarily, and engage with whom they please.

exposed to want, the law compelled the punctual payment of their hire, on the very day that it became due. It was either to be paid before sunset, see Deut. xxiv. 15; Tobit, iv. 14; or at least it should on no account remain until sunrise next day, Lev. xix. 13. An example of this custom appears in the parable of the Householder, Matt. xx. 8, who, when evening was come, directed his steward to call his labourers to receive their hire. The same is alluded to, Job, vii. 2.

The most express commands are given in the Mosaic law, not to oppress hired servants in these respects. The Jews are exhorted "*not to oppress the hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of the Hebrew brethren, or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates;*" and commanded, "*at his day shalt thou give him his hire, for he is poor and setteth his heart upon it, lest he cry against thee unto the Lord, and it shall be sin unto thee;*" Deut. xxiv. 14, 15: nor is it only said, Luke, x. 7, that the labourer is worthy of his hire, but the most heavy judgments are denounced against those who do not punctually fulfil their pecuniary engagements to hired servants. See Deut. xxiv. 15; Jer. xxii. 13; Mal. iii. 5; Eccclus. xxxiv. 20—22; James, v. 4.

Hired servants were by no means held in the same esteem for fidelity and attachment to their masters as purchased servants. Thus whilst we continually find purchased or home-born servants occupying places of the highest trust, we meet with frequent intimations that hired servants were proverbially untrustworthy, and that no bond of attachment subsisted between them and their temporary masters. Hence our Saviour says, John, x. 12, 13, "*He that is an hireling, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming and leaveth the sheep and fleeth. The hireling fleeth because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep.*"

It has been observed that servants of every description, as well as free men, partook of all the religious privileges belonging to their national class.

Hired servants were not, however, to partake of the passover with their master's household, *Exod. xii. 45*; nor were they, at the sacrifices of the family, to join with them in eating the holy thing, nay, even though their master should be a priest; *Lev. xxii. 10*. The reason for this injunction might perhaps be, that since the hired servant did not live in the master's house, it might not be easy, in case of a fraudulent assertion on the part of the servant, to detect whether he were a stranger or a Jewish proselyte. If the former, the paschal institution, or the sacrifice, would be profaned, by the participation of a Gentile; but if the servant were actually a Hebrew, he then had the privilege of partaking with his own household and family in their religious festivals, as well as in their daily social meals. And thus, as every Hebrew was obliged to keep these religious institutions with his own family, the religious instruction of every household was provided for. Thus did the mercy of God institute abundant means, by which the tie of a religious, as well as a social union, should be formed, and be constantly maintained, between all the members of the same family.

The hired servant was also entitled to his civil rights equally with the master. If a Hebrew, he was under that Divine law which was common to them all; and if a stranger, it is expressly stated that there is one law to the Hebrew and to the stranger; *Exod. xii. 49*; *Lev. xxiv. 22*; *Numb. xv. 15, 16, 29*, and *ix. 14*.

CHAPTER V.

PURCHASED SERVANTS.

PURCHASED servitude amongst the Jews was either, like hired servitude, voluntary on the part of the servant, or else, the deprivation of liberty was a punishment annexed by the Jewish law to certain offences.

First, liberty was lost by a voluntary surrender. When a person in reduced circumstances, or temporary difficulties, but of education and habits superior to the lowest class, wished an occupation in which skill and fidelity might be exerted, and consideration and a participation in his former comforts be retained, he sold himself voluntarily, either to one of his Hebrew brethren, or to one of the opulent strangers within the gates. Both instances of such voluntary surrender are contemplated by the Mosaic law; Lev. xxv. 39—47; and Isaiah, l. 1.

Under this head we may also include that of a father burthened with a large family of small children, and selling them, which he might do, till they were of age; see Exod. xxi. 7. A boy amongst the Jews is considered of age at thirteen, and a girl at twelve; beyond that age the parent could not sell them.

Secondly, liberty was forfeited by a judicial sentence, inflicted under the following circumstances:—

Insolvent debtors were sold by their creditors, to defray their own debts, Matt. xviii. 25; or those of their parents, if maintained by them, Matt. xviii. 25; or if, their parent being dead, they inherited his property, 2 Kings, iv. 1, 7; and Isaiah, l. 1.

Thieves, who had not wherewith to make full restitution, both of the thing stolen, and also of the legal fine, which was in many cases quadruple or quintuple its value, became by that means insolvent debtors, and were sold by the magistrate; see Exod. xxii. 3, 4, and i.—iii.; also 2 Sam. xii. 6; Luke, xix. 8; Prov. vi. 31.

Thirdly, in case of war. If the garrison of a city and its male inhabitants had been destroyed by Hebrews, they were bound to adopt the daughters of that city, unless Canaanites, into their households, as handmaidens; Deut. xx. 14.

Fourthly, children whose mothers were slaves, remained so themselves till they were of age, that is, till the sons were thirteen, and the daughters twelve—when

both children and mother were free. Thus masters were compelled to maintain and provide for their handmaidens and children, till they were of an age to maintain themselves. Were this custom borne in mind, the sending forth of Hagar and Ishmael would appear in a very different light to that in which it is generally viewed. Ishmael had very long since attained the age when it was usual* to emancipate both mother and son—when their obligation to remain, and that of Abraham to retain them in his household, ceased. Children amongst the Hebrews always followed the mother's condition.

There was also another case in which slavery partook both of a judicial sentence and a voluntary choice. This was, when persons had become slaves by a judicial sentence or by birth, but after their legal period of servitude expired, chose still to remain in the family, which they in truth considered as their own. This in fact was the case with most Hebrew servants. Thus we trace Eleazar, the home-born slave of Abraham, for sixty years in his family. Again, we hear of Abraham's three hundred and eighteen home-born servants who bore arms. All these persons would by the Mosaic law, and must then probably have been by custom, free at thirteen.

The various species of purchased servants are in Scripture designated by various appropriate terms. Thus all purchased servants are generally included under the term—*all that were bought with money*, Gen. xvii. 23; whilst those who, being the children of female slaves, were so by birth, are termed *those born in his house*, Gen. xvii. 23, 27; or *home-born slaves*, Jer. ii. 14; or

* We say *was usual*, because, although the Mosaic law was not then given, yet we conceive it to have been declarative and recapitulatory of many previous Divine institutions. Thus, the rites of sacrifice were known to Abel, Abraham, and Job, and Noah: the distinction between clean and unclean beasts was known to Noah. These are but one or two of many usages afterwards established by law, which were practised by the patriarchs.

simply *home-born*, Gen. xiv. 14. They were also very frequently termed *sons of handmaids*, Psalm lxxxvi. 16, Psalm cxvi. 16, owing to the circumstance of children always following the mother's condition. With respect to the servants bought with money, they were still farther subdivided into the two kinds — *man-servants or maid-servants, being Hebrews*, see Jer. xxxiv. 9; or *men bought with money of the stranger*, see Gen. xvii. 27. It is necessary to observe that under the term Hebrew all proselytes were included.

The acquisition of slaves by any other means than those above described, viz. voluntary choice or judicial sentence, was termed *man-stealing*.

And, under the Jewish law, *man-stealing* was punished by death—*Iarchi* says, by strangulation. And this law applied equally to the man who stole a Hebrew or a stranger and foreigner: “*If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and maketh merchandise of him, or selleth him, then that thief shall die; and thou shalt put away evil from amongst you;*” Deut. xxiv. 7. And again, in Exod. xxi. 16, “*He that stealeth a man (that is, any man, Hebrew or foreigner,) and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.*” By the first of these laws, the stealing a Hebrew, or using one unlawfully acquired as a servant, which is meant by the expression making merchandise, or the selling him, is visited with death. By the second, the same punishment is denounced on whoever not only steals any man, but even has in his possession a man originally stolen.*

* The Mishnic doctors interpret these laws in their strictest sense. Maimonides, upon these texts, interprets the expression “brethren of the children of Israel” thus: “that is, whether upgrown or little, male or female, Israelite or Jewish proselyte;” all are equally included. And *Iarchi* explains the term, “making merchandise and selling,” to mean either selling or using as merchandise; that is, using a man, against his will, as a servant lawfully purchased. Yea, though he should use his services only to the value of a farthing, or use but his arm to lean on to

Accordingly, St. Paul includes men-stealing in the catalogue of the most hideous and abominable crimes which can brutalize human nature; see 1 Tim. i. 9 and 10: and amongst the crimes of Babylon the great, the *smoke of whose torment ascended for ever*, we find recorded her "*making merchandise of slaves and of the souls of men.*" This, we presume, is always literally perpetrated where servitude is purchased; and the moral and religious sense stifled by the want of moral and religious instruction. We are aware that this text has, during a period of party zeal, of which enlightened Protestant England is now ashamed, been exclusively applied to stigmatise the worst abuses (I will not say of the Catholic church, for such practices she does not recognise), but of some of the worst men who disgraced the papal tiara. But we ask, if the moral and religious sense be blunted for a mercenary and interested purpose, is it not equally making a merchandise of the souls of men, whether the instrument used in effecting it be the indulgence of a pope or the cart-whip of a driver? The deprivation of the power of reading the Scripture is the same, whether effected by a papal bull or the act of a colonial legislature. And does the merchandise in human souls assume a superior quality when its profits are to furnish the costly mansions, and wines, and equipage, of the British merchant, to what it does when they are employed in erecting the consecrated dome of St. Peter, or adorning with Scripture pieces the walls of the Vatican?

All slavery amongst the Jews was temporary. No Hebrew could be sold for a longer period than until the return of the sabbatical year, be that when it would; consequently, the very longest period for which slavery could be imposed upon a Hebrew was six years. Deut. xv. 12, 18; Exod. xxi. 2; Lev. xxv. 1—6.

support him, if he be forced so to act as a servant, the person compelling him but once to do so shall die as a thief, whether he has sold him or not. — See *Gill on Deut.* xxiv. 7.

At the expiration of that time the master was not only to send out the slave free, but he was not to send him away empty, but to furnish him liberally from his flock, his floor, and his wine-press. Deut. xv. 12—14. And if the slave was married when he entered his master's service, he went out with his wife and children. Exod. xxi. 1, 2, 3.*

If, however, the slave, at the end of the six years, will not go away, because he loves his master and his house, and is comfortable there, Deut. xv. 16, 17; or if his master had given him a wife after he entered his service, and that the wife was not entitled to quit; the man, if he was attached to his wife, and did not wish to divorce her, was to tell his master he did not wish to quit him: and they both went together before the spiritual elders of the place in which they resided; and the master, in their presence, bored the ear of the slave with an awl to the door-post; after which he was bound to serve his master for ever—Deut. xv. 16, 17; Exod. xxi. 5, 6—that is, as the Jewish expression is defined, Lev. xxv. 10, until the next jubilee, when all the family was to go out free, Lev. xxv. 41.†

The same laws subsisted as to the going out of maids as of men-servants. Deut. xv. 12 and 17. The case, then,

* The slave, say the Mishnic doctors, is to go out in the same condition as he came in, with the same dress, &c. But he is not only to go free, but to be liberally provided by his master from his flock, floor, and wine-press, Deut. xv. 19; that is to say, adds *Maimonides* and *Bartenora*, in *Mishna Kiddushim*, chap. i. sect. 2, and *Munster Paginus* and *Vatablus*, דַּעֲקָה וְדַעֲקָה, *onerando oneratis*, loading ye shall load him, likewise every one of his family, with as much as he can take with him, abundant benefits, that he may remember you in his prayers, and not perish till he be provided elsewhere: and if he avariciously ask, How much must I give him? I say unto you, not less than thirty shekels worth, which is the mulct of a servant, so declared in Exod. xxi. 32. See *Maimon. Hileoth. Obedius*, chap. ii. sect. 3.

† For, say the Mishnic doctors, every man's wife and children are one flesh, and part of himself. The master who buys him buys them;

of the woman not being entitled to go out at the sabbatical year, could only occur when she had previously had her ear bored to stay till jubilee. Many of the Mishnaic doctors state, that the ear of the female slave was to be bored by her mistress, as well as that of a slave by his master, if she chose to remain beyond the sabbatical year. The female slave had, on the other hand, the same sacrifice to make if she married a slave whose ear was bored, and who had forfeited his right of going out till jubilee. Others have supposed that, in any case, the female slave was bound to stay with her children till they were thirteen; till which time they were the master's, if born of a marriage entered into after the parties were his slaves. See Exod. xxi. 4. Female slaves, the Mishnaic doctors observe, went out with gifts, like male slaves. This appears confirmed by the conduct of the Israelites on quitting the bondage of Egypt. They, in strict conformity with their own customs on quitting slavery, asked for gifts. Every man asked of his neighbour, and every woman of her's — Exod. xi. 2, and xii. 35, 36 — that is, the men and women slaves asked of the Egyptians that which they were always in the habit of doing for their own slaves. *

Although slaves were, in law, always entitled to be liberated at the sabbatical year, yet, in point of fact, it should seem that they generally, or, at least, very frequently, made it their choice to remain with their masters till jubilee. Thus Eleazar, Ziba, Gehazi, and many others, may be traced as living with the same persons for a long course of years. This will not appear extraor-

who releases him, in so doing releases them; and who redeems him redeems them. Numerous examples occur in Scripture, both amongst Hebrews and pagans, by which it appears that the whole family were considered as inseparably linked together. See Matt. xviii. 25; Dan. vi. 24.

* And which was immediately after established as a part of the Mosaic law.

dinary, when we recollect that Hebrews were not sold for slaves until their land and personal property had first been alienated to pay their debts. Now, as inheritances were only revertible to the original possessors at jubilee,* and not at the sabbatical year, it is obvious that they could until that time have no inheritance to go to. Consequently, as the Hebrews were chiefly agriculturists, and left handicraft labour to the strangers within the gates, there were very few ways in which the money they might have saved in their master's service could establish them; though it would enable them to pursue many independent sources of gratification as members of another person's household. Hence, in truth, the liberation at the end of the sixth year generally operated rather as a permission to change a disagreeable service, than as an inducement to quit all servitude. Jewish proselytes and homeborn slaves had a still deeper interest in remaining in the same family than Israelites; because, by so doing, they in the second generation obtained an inheritance in the land. Ezek. xlvii. 22, 23.

It has been observed that slaves received gifts in going out at the sabbatical year. Nothing is said of their receiving any at the year of jubilee. The reason appears to be, that as no man sold himself and family till he had previously parted with his other possessions; and inheritances being not revertible in the sabbatical year, it was just to give him that which would maintain himself and family until he had provided himself another service. Whereas, at the year of jubilee, as all the inhabitants of the land returned to their own possessions, such a provision was unnecessary.

We are not, however, to imagine that masters were to make their servants gifts only at their departure. Masters were threatened with heavy judgments, not only if they

* It will be observed that jubilee was not instituted in the time of Eliezer, but this, on our argument, forms an additional motive for his staying.

did not send out their servants free at the sabbatical year and at the year of jubilee, but if they did not constantly give them what was just and equal. Jer. xxxiv. 8—22; Col. iv. 1.

A Hebrew, who had either through poverty voluntarily sold himself, or had from debt or theft been sold to a wealthy stranger within the gates, was entitled to just the same advantages of the sabbatical year and jubilee as if he had been sold to a Jew; for there was one law to the Hebrew and to the stranger. Exod. xii. 49; Lev. xxiv. 22; Num. xv. 15—29. But, in that case, the stranger was farther to allow him to be at once redeemed by his own people,* by his family, or by *himself*; an expression which plainly proves that slaves possessed property independent of their masters. Lev. xxv. 47—49. The price of the Hebrew slave was calculated by the number of years he had to serve up to the sabbatical year; or, if his ear was bored, up to the time of jubilee. Lev. xxv. 47—54.

A slave being redeemed, he became the slave of the person redeeming him for the remainder of his time until the sabbatical year. His redeemer might either keep him, or was at liberty to sell him to another for that time. Lev. xxv. 47—49.

A Hebrew could not be sold but by himself to one not of his own nation. Compare Joseph. Antiq., lib. iv. 16, cap. 1, sect. 2; Lev. xxv. 42. Hebrew slaves were then liberated in the following manner: first, when sold to strangers, and often at other times with their masters' consent, by redemption, Lev. xxv. 47—53; or by the sabbatical year and year of jubilee, Deut. xv. 12, and Lev. xxv. 40, 41; or by the death of their masters,

* The Targums of Jonathan Ben Uzziel and Jarchi, also Maimonides and Abarbinel, all speak in the strongest terms of the duty of ransoming the Israelite or proselyte from the heathen, lest he should be tempted to idolatry. See *Targum Onk. Jon. Iarchi et Ben Melech in loc. Kinchi in Sepher Shoresh, rad. עקר*; et vide *Petishka apud Drusium in loco*.

leaving no sons, no slaves being bound to serve his daughters or other heirs, (see Jarchi) ; or, if children, by their becoming of age — that is, the boy is free at 13, and the girl at 12. Freedom, on this account, is mentioned by the rabbinical writers who treat on the subject ; and it is obviously included in the law of God, which does not allow any one to be enslaved but for a breach of the law. It appears, however, that the home-born, as well as other slaves, frequently preferred living with their masters ; as in the case of Abraham's 318 home-born servants. Besides all these means of liberation, slaves were also frequently manumitted by their master's voluntary choice ; see Neh. v. 1—15.

The observations hitherto made on the liberation of purchased servants, the reader may observe, have been chiefly confined to Hebrew servants ; but, in fact, they included nearly all servants. For although strangers within the gate were equally liable to slavery as Hebrews, yet, in point of fact, no Hebrew was allowed to keep any servant in his household who did not embrace the Jewish faith within the year ; and that being done, he ceased to be a stranger, and commenced Hebrew ; on which he was consequently entitled to the benefit of all laws respecting Hebrews : nor might any purchased or homeborn slave be suffered to remain in a Hebrew family on any other terms. All persons, whether born in the house, that is home-born, or bought with money of the stranger, were to be brought into the Mosaic covenant. Gen. xvii. 10—14.* The Hebrew servants were, of

* Maimonides says, " Whether a servant be born in the power of an Israelite, or whether he be purchased from the heathen, the master is to bring them both into the covenant. But he that is born in the house is to be entered in upon the eighth day ; and he that is bought with money on the day on which the master receives him, unless the slave be unwilling. For, if the master receives a grown slave," continues Maimonides, " and that he be unwilling, his master is to bear with him, to seek to win him over by instruction and by love and kind-

course, already within the covenant. Hence we see, in Gen. xvii. 23—27, Abraham, Ismael, his son, and all the men of his house, both homeborn and servants purchased of the strangers, all entered into the Jewish covenant on the selfsame day. Persons quitted the strangers, and became Jewish proselytes, by the three initiatory rites of circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice; after which they were accounted Hebrews.* All thus entering into the Jewish covenant were debtors to the whole law to do it; Gal. v. 3. They were consequently entitled to all its privileges. Hence it is obvious that the slavery of the strangers within the gates was temporary, equally with that of the Hebrews; for they either adopted the Hebrew faith, or they did not: if they did, they were entitled to every privilege appertaining to Hebrew servants; and if not, they went out at the expiration of the first year. Hence the remark of our SAVIOUR, "*The servant abideth not in the house for ever,*" John, viii. 35, applies equally in the case of the stranger as of the Hebrew servant — of the purchased as of the hired servant. The Mishnic doctors say, that the stranger slave sent out to his own people at the end of the year, had a reasonable compensation for his service, and his charges were paid. This, however, ought probably to be understood only if he had sold himself from poverty. We ought also, probably, to understand, that though transferred to one of his own people, the slave was bound to fulfil his appointed time of slavery. This, we apprehend, must be understood;

ness for one year: after which, should he refuse so long, it is forbidden to keep him longer than the twelvemonth: and the master must send him back to the strangers, from whence he came; for the GOD of Jacob will not accept any other than the worship of a willing heart." — *Maimon. Hilcoth Miloth*, chap. i. sect. 8. See *Gill*.

* Maimonides observes, "A Gentile who is become a proselyte, and a slave who is set at liberty, both become, as it were, new-born babes; which is the reason why the persons who are by nature their parents are no longer accounted so: for they now become the adopted children of the family which has brought them in to God, by the strong tie of a new and spiritual paternity."

otherwise every thief or debtor of the strangers might easily evade his legal sentence, by refusing to adopt the Jewish religion, and thus recover the liberty he had justly forfeited at the end of the first year. We also conceive that, understood in this manner, this regulation offers to the stranger a privilege, precisely analogous to that possessed by the Hebrew slave, of being redeemed by his own people, and that it is therefore consonant with the often-repeated maxim, that *there shall be one law to the Hebrew and to the stranger*.

In one respect, indeed, the condition of the Israelite slave differed from that of the proselyte. The Israelite went back at jubilee to his inheritance; whereas the Hebrew proselyte, coming from the stranger, had no land to go to. Hence proselytes and home-born slaves, who were their children generally in fact, considered themselves as the adopted children of the family they served, and seldom did go out though they might do so: and, as we have elsewhere observed, though free to depart, they had yet a strong inducement to stay; because, by so doing, they established in the second generation their title to an inheritance; Prov. xvii. 2; Ezek. xlvii. 22, 23. Besides which, having adopted the Jewish faith, the tie to their own people was broken, and a new one formed to the family they entered. Hence, though possessing a power to go, they had yet sufficient motive, if comfortable, to stay. Many other reasons also might induce proselytes to remain, which will appear hereafter.

Besides the periods above mentioned for the expiration of slavery, there were other circumstances which entitled the slave to immediate liberation. *He who smites his man or maid-servant that they die under his hand, shall surely be punished*; Exod. xxi. 20; that is, by death, as it appears from the preceding verses — see Exod. xxi. 12—19, and Lev. xxiv. 17,* — where it is

* The targum of Jonathan and Jarchi consider this word *punishment*, which evidently refers to Exod. xxi. 12, as signifying death by the sword, which was the punishment for murder.

expressly stated, that *he that killeth a man shall surely be put to death*. When we take into the account, that at the master's death all the servants were restored to freedom if he had no sons; and that, whether he had or not, the wife* and children of the man freed from his tyranny by death were by that circumstance freed; and, unless it were jubilee, were entitled to go out with gifts; it will appear that the loss of property must have operated as a very heavy fine, independently of the capital punishment which was inflicted where no such bond subsisted as that between master and servant.

Again, if a master smote his man or maid-servant, so that they lost a limb, the servant was immediately to go out free; *Exod. xxi. 21—27*; that is, himself, his wife,* and children, and with gifts. The Mishnic doctors, in the targums of Jonathan Ben Uzziel and Jarchi, and also Aben Ezra, interpret the loss of limb as follows: "By a limb," say they, "is meant any one of the four-and-twenty principal members of the body; of which we count the fingers for one sort, the toes for another, &c. By the loss of a limb is understood its loss for use or beauty; that is, any injury which leaves a permanent effect or a permanent mark." On this point the Jews were peculiarly strict, the reasons for which were very obvious. As slavery amongst the Jews was only a temporary misfortune or punishment, no crime was visited with greater severity than a master's so misusing his authority, as to inflict any punishment which would leave a dishonourable badge of his former servitude on one who would soon, like his master, be a free man.

The temporary nature of slavery amongst the Hebrews ensured it against abuses: laws were not only made to protect the slave, but this circumstance effectually ensured their enforcement.

The state of servitude amongst the Hebrews was

* Unless, perhaps, previously to her marriage the wife was the master's slave; *Exod. xxi. 4*.

never considered as implying a degrading inferiority of condition, however it might mark difference of fortune, or sometimes error in conduct. Servants were considered as being quite in the same class of society as their masters; they were their associates, their friends, their domestic family circle. Slaves and masters did not form amongst the Hebrews two distinct classes of persons, severed by an impassable boundary; on the contrary, the whole Jewish population constituted one body, the individuals of which were continually passing and repassing from the one condition to the other. Every master might himself one day become a servant, and must no doubt be closely connected with many who were so. Every servant was closely connected with masters, and must himself, in six years at farthest, become free. Hence the Divine laws not only commanded the kind treatment of servants, but the very condition of slavery in Judæa was of a nature which interested masters, equally with servants, in its peremptory enforcement.

Accordingly, we may trace the operation of these causes, throughout both the occupation and condition of purchased servants.

Hebrew purchased servants* were not to serve as bond-servants, or servants from the bondsmen, but as hired Hebrew servants; Lev. xxv. 39, 40:† that is to say, Hebrew servants were not to perform those servile, or personal menial offices, which were exclusively fulfilled by strangers within the gates, either for hire, or within their twelvemonth of probation, if purchased servants. Lest we should imagine the strangers to be

* That is, Jews, or Jewish proselyte servants.

† The ordinary work of the household was on festivals not to be performed by Hebrews, Lev. xxiii. 7, 8, 21, 25, 35, 36; Numb. xxviii. 18, 25, 26; Numb. xxix. 1, 12, 35. As these festivals often recurred connected with the command, Lev. xxv. 39, 40, it became an established custom to have menial servants entirely of hired strangers.

harshly dealt with, it may be necessary to state, that those menial offices are precisely those offices of personal attendance which all our English free servants daily and willingly perform. It was not hard labour, but personal services which were rendered by the servants of the strangers, and which the Hebrews were exempted from.*

Hence it appears, that no menial services could long be exacted from any one against his will : since the bondsmen or strangers, to whose lot (if servants) they fell, either undertook them voluntarily for hire as our English servants do ; or else, if they became purchased servants, which could only happen by their own free choice, or for debt or theft, still, such menial offices could not be exacted from them the moment they became Jewish proselytes ; and this the master was obliged to propose to them on the very day of their purchase. If they refused, they could not be kept, and consequently, these services could not be imposed above one twelvemonth. When we consider the gross idolatry and ignorance of the Canaanites and Philistines, may we not suppose, that when the Divine law appointed them to personal services, it was with the beneficent view that, by being brought into close contact with those who knew the true God, they might be won over by observing the fruits of true religion ?

The treatment of purchased, in which we always include home-born servants, was precisely like that of

* Jarchi explains this by saying, that a Hebrew servant is not required to do any thing which is accounted mean ; by which are intended all offices of personal attendance, as loosing his master's shoe-latchet, bringing him water to wash his feet and hands, waiting on him at table, dressing him, or carrying him things to and from the bath. The Hebrew servant is to work with his master as a son, or brother, in the business of his farm, or other labour, until his legal release. He is, as the Scripture says, to " be with him," that is, his master's companion ; see Gill on Lev. xxv. 39, 40.

other members of the family. The direction, Lev. xxv. 40, that the Hebrew servant "*shall be as a sojourner with thee,*" the Jews understand in the most literal sense.*

Hebrew purchased servants were generally placed in offices of the highest trust. They were especially entrusted with arms, and as the Jewish army was composed only of a militia, formed of all males from twenty to fifty, so every master trained his servants as his contingent towards the defence of the country. Thus Abraham pursued and conquered the five confederate kings, at the head of his armed home-born servants, Genesis xiv. 14. Esau approached Jacob at the head of four hundred armed servants, Gen. xxxiii. 1. When Jerusalem was rebuilt, we find the Jewish masters arming their servants to defend them against the attacks of Sanballat, Nehem. iv. 22.

Purchased servants were in Palestine treated, both by Jews and strangers, with precisely the same affectionate care as other members of the family. Thus we find, Luke, vii. 2, 3, 4, that a centurion having a servant sick, who is expressly stated to be "*dear unto him,*" went to the Jewish elders of the magnificent city of Capernaum, sending them to beseech Jesus to cure his servant. Nor does it appear that either the Roman centurion, or the Jewish chief magistrates thought it in any degree derogatory to their high dignity to be employed in such a commission. No surprise is testified at the request; on

* Accordingly the Mishnic doctors interpret Lev. xxv. 40 as follows:—"The law of God says, *as a sojourner shall the Hebrew servant be with thee.*" Now the expression *with thee,* means, he shall be thy companion; for the purchased servant who is an Israelite or proselyte, shall fare as his master. The master shall not eat fine bread, and his servant bread of bran; nor yet drink old wine, and give his servant new; nor sleep on soft pillows and bedding, and his servant on straw. I say unto you, that he that gets a purchased servant does well to make him as his friend, or he will prove to his employer as if he got himself a master. *Maimonides in Mishna Kiddushim*, chap. i. sect. 2; and *Gill on the above texts.*

the contrary, it is expressly stated that *they went and besought Jesus instantly.*

Servants among the Hebrews bore no ignominious mark of servitude, as amongst the Greeks and Romans. This was the necessary consequence of their servitude being temporary. It is obvious from many passages in Scripture, that they could in no way be distinguished from the most respected members of the family, and that they were treated with precisely the same consideration. Thus, when Abraham sends his home-born slave, Eliezer, to Nahor, with ten camels and several men-servants, Gen. xxiv. 10—30, Eliezer, the slave, thus addressed Rebekah, the daughter of this wealthy and powerful Emir:—“*Let me I pray thee drink a little water from thy pitcher.*” She again replies to this home-born slave, “*DRINK, MY LORD :** and she hasted and let down the pitcher upon her own hand, and gave him to drink ; and when she had done giving him to drink, she said I will draw water for thy camels also, until they have done drinking ; and she hasted and emptied her pitcher into the trough, and ran again unto the well and drew for all the camels.” Gen. xxiv. 18—21. This passage renders it obvious that the condition of a home-born slave was marked by no degrading circumstance in appearance or demeanor.

After Eliezer has formally declared himself to be Abraham’s home-born slave, Gen. xxiv. 27, 34, we find just the very same respectful treatment still continue. Laban, the Emir’s son, and brother of his future mistress, thus addresses him :—“*Come thou blessed of the Lord, wherefore standest thou without ?*”† Laban then himself

* It is the condition of Hebrew home-born slaves, be it remembered, which is urged by colonists to be analogous to that of negro field-slaves.

† The reader will judge how far this coincides with the manner in which a field-slave would be received by an Englishman of far inferior rank to that of Laban.

ungirded the camels, and brought water to wash Eliezer's feet, and those of his servants, and put meat before them.* Gen. xxiv. 30—33.

Again, when Saul and his servant, searching after their lost asses, go to inquire of the prophet Samuel, in a city of the land of Zuph, we are told they arrived on a festival day. Samuel had convened the inhabitants of the city to a solemn sacrifice in the high place, or market place, and he had invited about thirty of the principal persons of the city to a feast which he was to give after it was over. As soon, however, as Saul arrived, we are told that Samuel took not only Saul, but also his servant, *and brought them both into the parlour*, and made not only him, Saul, but *them*, both Saul and his servant also, *sit in the chiefest place, amongst them that were bidden.*† 1 Sam. ix. 1—22.

Likewise, when Samuel wished the next day to speak to Saul in private, he told him to order his servant, (who must therefore have been previously walking in their company) *to pass on before*, that he might speak to him alone; 1 Sam. ix. 27.

Other Oriental nations appear, like the Hebrews, to have maintained the same terms of affection and respect between masters and servants. Thus, when the servants of the enraged Naaman wished to persuade their master to follow the prophet's direction of bathing seven times in the stream of Jordan, we find them addressing him, not in

* We find that Elah, the son of Basha, king of Israel, not only familiarly associated with, but drank himself drunk in the house of Arzah, steward of his house in Tirza, 1st Kings, xvi. 8, 9; yet Arzah must have been a purchased servant; but from the passage cited he must have possessed independent property, or he would have had no house in which to receive the king.

† Afterwards it is said, Samuel directed his cook to place before Saul the shoulder which he had reserved for him, because the shoulder was, amongst the Jews, often a type of dominion. A memento to rulers, of the burden rather than the vain honour they were called to; see Isaiah, ix. 4—6; and xxii. 22; and xi. 4.

terms of servile fear and adulation, but in these words : "MY FATHER, *if the prophet had bade thee do some great thing,*" &c. &c.; 2 Kings, v. 13. And again we find the very same Naaman, whom we are told at the beginning of the chapter, was "*Captain of all the host of the king of Syria, a great man and an honourable,*" yet a few verses on, alighting from his chariot, and turning back on foot, notwithstanding his exalted dignity, to meet Gehazi, the unfaithful servant of Elisha, 2 Kings, v. 21.

Purchased servitude was not in Judæa the abjectly dependent state we may imagine. Some have supposed that the exhortations to masters to *give their servants that which was just and equal*, implied that purchased as well as hired servants received some remuneration. Others have thought that they had certain offices imposed, and had liberty to employ themselves on their own account afterwards. However this may be, it is certain, that although persons became servants from poverty, they yet had some means of acquiring property whilst in servitude; and that this property was their own, independently of their masters. This appears from the remarkable expression of Scripture concerning the redemption of Hebrew servants sold to strangers :—it is declared, Lev. xxv. 47, 49, that *if a Hebrew, being poor, sell himself to a stranger, he may be redeemed again by his brethren, or by HIMSELF, if he is able*. As it is expressly there stated that he became a servant from poverty, there must have been some method, subsequent to his entrance into slavery, by which this sum might be acquired.* Although Gehazi fraudulently obtained a present from Naaman, in the name of his master, of two changes of raiment, and two talents of silver, or £683. 0s. 8d.; yet Gehazi would not have attempted such a theft, had his possessing such

* Aben Ezra uses the same expression in speaking of a female slave, who, at the appointed time, was to be redeemed by her father, or by HERSELF.

a sum, and using it, been likely to awaken suspicion. Accordingly, Elisha only expresses displeasure at the means which he took to receive "*garments and oliveyards, and vineyards, and sheep and oxen, and men-servants and maid-servants*;" 2 Kings, v. 25. The purchased or home-born servants of men of distinction, frequently themselves were possessed of very great wealth. Thus Ziba, who was servant, first to the house of Saul, and who was afterwards given by David to Saul's grandson, Mephibosheth, had himself, it appears, no less than twenty servants of his own; 2 Sam. ix. 10.

Accordingly, we find purchased and home-born servants continually placed by their masters in places of the highest trust, and exercising the fullest authority, as the master's vicegerents over the household. Thus we find Ziba bringing to David a present of two asses, two hundred loaves, a hundred bunches of raisins, as many portions of fruit, and a skin of wine, which were offered by him, and received by David, as a thing of course, without consulting his master; see 2 Sam. xvi. 1, 2. Again in Matt. xxv. 14—30, we find in the parable of the talents, a master entrusting his servants with money to trade to a very large amount. According to the usual calculation of the value of silver talents at £341. 10s. 4½d., he must have trusted one of his servants with about £1707. 11s. 10d., and the others in proportion.

Again in Luke, xii. 42—44, we find the purchased servant established ruler over the household; and in Matt. xxiv. 47, he is made ruler over all his master's goods.

In the family of Abraham, Eliezer, we are told, was his steward, Gen. xv. 2, 3; and in chap. xxiv. 2, it is added, that he ruled over all that he had; yet it is said in the same verse, that he was a servant; and in Gen. xv. 2 and 3, that he was a home-born slave, and born in Damascus.

Purchased servants seem to have been generally held in high consideration in the East. Thus we find among

the Egyptians the purchased servant, Joseph, raised to a post of the highest confidence in the household of Potiphar, the general in chief* of the reigning Pharaoh's forces. For Joseph himself declares that "*He left all that he had in Joseph's hand, and he knew not ought he had save the bread which he did eat;*" Gen. xxxix. 6. "*Behold,*" says Joseph, "*my master wotteth not what is with me in the house, and he hath committed all that he hath to my hand, and there is none greater in this house than I;*" Gen. xxxix. 8. Nor does this respectful treatment of slaves appear unusual: we find the gaoler following the example of Potiphar, and placing Joseph in a situation of equal trust in the prison, in which he was so unjustly confined.

It is indeed perfectly plain, from the whole tenour of Scripture, that the condition of a purchased servant or slave was never considered as in any respect a degrading or a dishonourable one. Had it been so, could Joseph, not only a purchased, but a *foreign* purchased slave, have been exalted to be viceroy over all Egypt? Gen. xli. 38—44. Every year of modern research diffuses a more extensive light over the wide field of Egyptian antiquity. Egypt, under the Pharaohs, boasted her nobles and her tributary princes in every part of the then known world. Could Joseph have been exalted in authority above them all, and placed immediately next to the throne itself, if slavery had been esteemed a degradation? In like manner we find Daniel, likewise a slave, exalted to the rank of chief minister of state in the court of Darius; Dan. vi. 1. We are expressly told, that the whole empire of Darius was divided into a hundred and twenty governments, at the head of each of which was placed a prince: immediately above these princes were appointed three presidents, who were principal ministers

* So we must translate that most appropriate Hebrew term "*Master of the slaughterers.*"

of state ; and over these three presidents, and second only to the king, was placed Daniel, the Hebrew slave—and he was set over the whole realm ; Dan. vi. 1—4. We leave it to those who support the system of Negro, by the precedent of Hebrew, Babylonish, or even Egyptian slavery, to point out the particulars of similarity.

When we observe the affection and high consideration with which faithful purchased servants were treated, we shall not be surprised at St. Paul's declaration,—“ *Now I say that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all ;* Gal. iv. 1. And the same apostle, speaking to Philemon of his newly converted Christian slave Onesimus, on the same principle which was recognized by Jews in their treatment of their proselyted Hebrew slaves, says, “ *Receive him not now as a servant,*” (that is, not as a Hebrew receives a servant of the strangers within the gate,) *but above a servant, as a brother beloved ;*” that is, ‘as we Hebrews receive those same strangers, when they are become our brethren, by being proselytes ;’ Phil. 16. Nor are we to think that the Hebrews were less kind to slaves of the strangers, though their occupations were different ; for they are commanded, Lev. xix. 34, *to love the strangers as themselves.*

Faithful purchased servants appear to have actually enjoyed the privileges mentioned by St. Paul. Solomon expressly says, Prov. xvii. 2, “ *A wise servant shall have rule over a son that causeth shame ;*” and he adds, “ *and he shall have part of the inheritance amongst the brethren.*” Home-born servants, indeed, were not only treated with affection and respect, but they were very frequently adopted, from mutual affection, into their master's family. Thus we find the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, the slaves of Leah and Rachel, and consequently home-born slaves themselves, inheriting among the children of the wives of Jacob. This was continually the case, where affection only, independently of relationship, bound

the parties together. "*He that delicately,*" or as it might rather be rendered, judiciously, "*brings up his slave from a child,*" says Solomon, Prov. xxix. 21, "*shall have him become his son at the last.*"

Masters were continually in the practice, if they had no children, of selecting one of their home-born servants, frequently the eldest, to inherit their property. Thus Eliezer of Damascus, a stranger, and Abraham's eldest home-born servant, would have been Abraham's heir had he been childless: compare Gen. xv. 2, 3 — Gen. xxiv. 2.

The practice of servants inheriting their masters' property when they had no children, appears to have obtained so generally, as to have possessed the force and certainty of a law—at least, so we must infer from the parable of the Bad Husbandmen—for when the husbandmen saw the son, they are represented as reasoning amongst themselves, and saying, "*This is the heir, come let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours;*" Luke, xx. 14; Mark, xii. 6, 7; Matt. xxi. 38. The reader will observe that the inheritance in question was not a sum of money, which might have been stolen and secreted by thieves, but a landed property, which the death of the son could not put them in possession of, unless the law were as we state it to be.

Where possessions were forfeited by the misconduct of masters, they appear to have been sometimes transferred to their servants, as in the case of the unfaithful Ziba, to whom David gave the possessions of his master, Mephibosheth; 2 Sam. xvi. 4.

Again, when masters had daughters only, they very frequently married them to their favourite servants. They appear to have preferred, both for adoption and for sons-in-law, those servants who were proselytes from the strangers, or the home-born sons of proselytes, before servants who were Israelites, or relations, not their own children. Thus Abraham preferred Eliezer to his nephew

Lot, and to the family of Nahor; since, had he not had sons of his own, he would have made Eliezer his heir instead of these near relatives; Gen. xv. 1, 3. In the book of Chronicles, 1 Chron. ii. 34, 35, we find the opulent Sheshan giving his daughter in marriage to Jarrha, an Egyptian slave.

The reason why, in such cases, purchased or home-born slaves of the proselytes were preferred to slaves of the Israelites, was probably this,—that a double inheritance might not be allowed in one family, which would have been the case if an only daughter added her inheritance to that of a Hebrew husband, who was of course also entitled to an inheritance* on his part.

In like manner, also, masters or their sons constantly intermarried with their female slaves.

Hence, also, proselytes and home-born sons of proselyte slaves were entitled to go out of servitude in the sixth year, or at coming of age, like other Hebrews; they had yet a very strong inducement, if they were comfortable, to remain in the same family. They not only were entitled to gifts at the master's death if he had children, and to his inheritance, if he had none, but they claimed an inheritance if they remained till the second generation: besides which they had a probability, if found faithful, of being adopted into their master's family, or being incorporated into it by marriage.

It is therefore not to be wondered at, that instances so continually occur in Scripture of servants remaining for a long period in one family. Eliezer, the servant of Abraham, may be traced in the family of his master for sixty years; he may probably have lived with him longer, for Eliezer was Abraham's steward when he had the vision between the pieces, Gen. xv. 2: this was

* The Mishnic doctors tell us that when a marriage took place between an only daughter and a proselyte servant, the servant was freed, adopted by the master, took his name and inheritance, and stood in all respects in the stead of a real son.

some time before Hagar was given to Abraham ; but Ishmael was full thirteen years of age when Isaac was born ; and Isaac was forty at the time that Eliezer went to seek him a wife. Bishop Usher places the vision of the pieces in A.M. 2092, and the marriage of Isaac in 2148 ; that is, these two circumstances are severed by an interval of fifty-six years. During all this time, Eliezer remained Abraham's steward. Now, as Eliezer was a home-born servant, and as we must allow a reasonable time from his birth to his commencing steward, it follows that he must have remained a considerable time in his master's service : if he commenced his stewardship at fourteen, which few will suppose possible, he must, even on that improbable supposition, have remained seventy years in Abraham's family.

We conceive that it will now plainly appear why the laws for the protection of slaves, against both oppression and personal violence, were not only enacted, but were sure to be most vigorously enforced. There was no slave of the Hebrews, who, in six years at farthest, would not again be a free man ; nor was there any slave of the strangers, by proselytism become a Hebrew, who might not one day, by marriage or adoption, enter his master's family. Under these circumstances, the pride of the master was as much interested as that of the servant, in never inflicting any punishment which might leave a dishonourable badge of his former servitude on a free man, and one whom he might soon be obliged to recognize as a near relation. All purchased and home-born servants were trained to arms, as their master's contingent to the Jewish army : they all likewise formed the DOMESTIC CIRCLE, amongst whom the master appointed his steward, Gen. xv. 2 ; or the merchants who conducted his caravan, or other traffic ; Matt. xxv. 14—25 ; Luke, xix. 13—27 ; or amongst whom he selected his heirs, if he had no children ; Gen. xv. 3 ; or often married his sons and daughters, if he had any ; 1 Chron. ii. 34, 35. Now

it would have been an eternal disgrace to the master to assemble sons and daughters-in-law round his board, or to have faced the enemy at the head of troops who bore already the shameful marks of the lash.

We shall now mention some laws which more particularly regard female slaves.

Females became slaves, either by being sold by their parents from distress, Exod. xxi. 7; or by being home-born: or else, being taken captives in war, when, being deprived of their natural protectors, their Hebrew conquerors were obliged to give them an asylum, as part of the domestic circle, in their own households; see Deut. xx. 14; Gen. xxxi. 26; 2 Chron. xxviii. 8; Numb. xxxi. 9.

A Hebrew bondmaid might not be sold by any one but her father, Exod. xxi. 7; nor by him, unless she were under twelve years old, nor unless the person he sold her to was himself a Hebrew; see *Jarchi*, *Aben Ezra*, and the *Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel*, as quoted in *Gill*, on Exodus, xxi. 7, 8; also *Joseph. Antiq.* l. xvi. c. 1, sect. 1, who expressly declares that no Hebrew could be sold but to a Hebrew.

A Hebrew girl could not be sold even to a Hebrew master, unless he entered into a contract to marry her himself, or to give her in marriage to his son as soon as she was of age; that is, when she attained twelve years: see *Maimon. Hilcoth Abadim*, c. iv. sec. 2: in *Mish Kiddushim*, c. i. sec. 2, as quoted in *Gill*, on Exod. xxi. 8. Nor might the father sell her, unless the purchaser laid himself under a heavy obligation so to do; see *Maimon. Hilcoth Abadim*, c. iv. sec. 2, in *Mishna Kiddushim*, c. i. sec. 2: *Jarchi* also adds, "The master is bound to espouse her, for the money of her purchase is that of her espousals."

That this interpretation of the Mishnic doctors is correct, appears from the denunciations in Scripture

against those masters who, having purchased Hebrew handmaids, do not choose to espouse them.

If a master had purchased a Hebrew handmaid, and when she was of age did not like her, and refused to espouse her to himself or his son, then, when she was of age, viz. twelve years, she shall not, as men-servants, wait to the sabbatical year to be free, but she shall be at once redeemed by her father, her relations, or her tribe; *Exod. xxi. 7, 8.* The master may on no pretence sell or keep her, but must, on the day she completes her twelfth year, either espouse, that is betroth her to himself or his son, or else set her free.*

Her redemption money was estimated by reckoning her price at the number of years still remaining to the sabbatical year: thus, suppose she had cost sixty pounds when first purchased, and that it was six years to the sabbatical year at the period of her being of age, she had served four years, two years still remaining to the sabbatical year, her price would then be twenty pounds.†

If the master, or his son, had proceeded to betroth the damsel to himself on her coming of age, but afterwards took another wife, he was compelled to allow her food, raiment, and a proper establishment, suitable to the dignity of his first wife; *Exod. xxi. 10, 11.* The word used in this text for food is *Shearah*, or flesh food, meaning a handsome maintenance.

*The Targum of Jonathan says, it was as incumbent on her father to redeem her, as it was on the master to let her be redeemed: *Aben Ezra* says, that she frequently redeemed *herself*, or she might be redeemed by any relation, so near as to be within the rules of marriage; that is by a father, brother, or uncle: otherwise, her house and tribe might jointly redeem her, for she might not be redeemed by any man singly, excepting by a near relation, under whose roof she might with propriety reside.

† See *Bartenora in Kiddushim*, c. i. sec. 2: also *Maimonides*, in *ibid.*

Likewise, if his master preferred his second wife, he was not at liberty to disinherit the children of the first; but if her son actually was the first-born, the father was compellable to give him the double portion which was due to him as such; Deut. xxi. 15—17.

If the master had betrothed the female slave to his son, he was compelled to treat her in every respect as a daughter, and to give her dowry accordingly; Exod. xxi. 9—18.

If the son married another wife afterwards, the same laws held good as in the case of the father; Exod. xxi. 9, 10.

And, if either father or son refused to comply with these rules, as it respected the slaves they had married, they were then to go out free; Exod. xxi. 11.*

In case of unfaithful conduct on the part of masters towards slaves of the strangers, they shall instantly be free; Deut. xxi. 11—14.

CHAPTER VI.

RELIGIOUS PRIVILEGES OF SERVANTS.

WE have already stated that the religious privileges of subjects of the Jewish theocracy depended not on their freedom or slavery, but on their belonging to the Gentile strangers, or the covenant of the Hebrews.

The religious privileges to which Gentile servants were invited, will be mentioned fully in the chapters on the strangers, to which we refer the reader.

With respect to those of Hebrew servants, and, as we have observed, no others could remain above a twelve-

* Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and Ben Melech, repeat the same thing; to which the Targum of Jonathan adds, "She shall not only go out free from slavery, but the master shall give her a bill of divorce."

month in a Hebrew family, more detailed observations shall here be made.

The law of God, however, whilst it so fully provided for the temporal good of servants, equally, nay still more, considered their eternal welfare, and that, whether they belonged to the strangers or the Hebrews.

All strangers, whether servants or free, were to be earnestly invited to enter into covenant with God; Deut. xxix. 10, 13; and they, together with the Hebrews, were to be diligently instructed in the law of God during the whole of the sabbatical year; Deut. xxxi. 9—13; Josh. viii. 33—35.

It has been observed, that all purchased servants from strangers were invited to enter into the Jewish covenant the first day of their purchase, and that all home-born servants were taken into covenant the eighth day after their birth.

All subjects of the Jewish theocracy enjoyed the rest of the sabbatical day, and that of the sabbatical year; Exod. xx. 10, 11; Deut. v. 14; Exod. xxiii. 9—13; Lev. xxv. 2—7.

All were privileged to enjoy freedom in the year of jubilee; Lev. xxv. 8—21; Exod. xxiii. 9, 10.

All purchased servants were to be invited to the three great festivals at Jerusalem, and to all the sacrifices made by their master's family; Deut. xii. 10—19; likewise to the feast of weeks; Deut. xvi. 8—12; and also, to that of tabernacles; Deut. xvi. 13—17.

All were likewise freely invited to worship in the temple, in the court of the Gentiles: but, in addition to this privilege, Hebrew servants, like the rest of their nation, were entitled to enter the court of the women, and that of Israel. They partook of the passover, Exod. xii. 44, 45; and they likewise ate freely of the holy thing; Lev. xxii. 10.

CHAPTER VII.

SUMMARY.

WE trust that the points we commenced by asserting, have now been fully proved, viz. :—

That servitude was in Judæa always voluntary, or else inflicted as a judicial punishment.

That it was in either circumstance only temporary, and was in every case cancelled by gross ill usage.

That the civil and religious privileges of each in Judæa, whether Hebrews or strangers, though different, were yet equally assured to them.

That the law of GOD assured to slaves, equally with masters, a full participation in every religious and civil privilege belonging to their class.

That the state of servitude implied no personal degradation, but that servants and freemen equally formed one social body, the members of which were continually interchanging.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONCLUSION.

IT now remains, in conclusion, to sum up the case of the Hebrew, and to compare it in each of its parts with the condition of the Negro slave. It will then appear how far the system of colonial slavery is sanctioned or condemned by that Scripture, which Protestant England professes to uphold as the only rule both of her faith and practice.

1. With the Hebrews, every man stealing a slave, or having one in his possession originally stolen, or whose liberty was taken by any other law than that given by GOD himself, was punished with DEATH.

In America and the West India colonies, no man has any slave, whose original possession was not either acquired by theft, or by the operation of customs of barbarous nations, in direct contradiction to the laws of God. *See Cries of Africa*, p p. 1—10.

2. With the Hebrews all slavery was voluntary, or else judicially imposed by the law of God and the country.

With the Negro all slavery is in violation of the will of the party, and is iniquitously imposed in flat contradiction to the law of God, and to the constitution of our country. *Cries of Africa*, p p. 1—10, and 19—36.

3. With the Hebrew all slavery was temporary, and could not be inflicted above six years.

With the Negro all slavery is perpetual, and descends from generation to generation. *See Negro Slavery*, p. 3, clauses 2 and 3.

4. With the Hebrew marriage was inviolable. The purchaser of the slave must become the purchaser of his wife and family.

With the Negro slave there is scarcely such a thing as marriage, nor is any restraint imposed with respect to separating families. *Negro Slavery*, p. 32, clause 2; *ibid.* p. 83, last clause ending over leaf. *Negro Slavery*, p p. 106, 107.

5. Hebrew slavery, though temporary, was a state from which one stripe, that left a permanent mark, delivered at once the sufferer and his family.

Colonial slavery, though perpetual, is a state from which death alone can deliver the sufferer, still leaving his wife and family to languish, as before, in hopeless captivity.

6. With the Hebrew, the slave was considered in the same rank as his master. He was interdicted from the imposition of any servile work, and was eligible to the first honours of the family and of the state.

The Negro slave has been, within far less than a century, publicly declared, in an English court of judicature, to be considered only as the beast of the field. He is restricted from any but servile work, and he is always exposed to the basest degree of contumely. *Negro Slavery*, pp. 15, 16; *ibid.* p. 18, *last clause on the page*; also p. 19. *Negro Slavery*, pp. 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65. *Negro Slavery*, p. 84, *clause 2*; also, p. 86, *clause 2*. *Brief View*, p. 1, *clauses 2, 3, 4, 8, 9*.

7. With the Hebrew, the slave was independent as to property, and was frequently possessed of wealth.

With the Colonist, the very limbs and life of the Negro are held at the caprice of another. *Negro Slavery*, p. 18, *last clause to the end of p. 24*. *Negro Slavery*, pp. 60 to 66. *Negro Slavery*, p. 68, *last clause*; p. 69, *first clause*, and 3d and 4th clauses; *ibid.* p. 70, *clause 2*; *ibid.* p. 86, *clause 2*.

8. With the Hebrew, there was one law, both for the master and the slave.

With the Negro, there is one law for the master, and a totally different one for the slave. *Negro Slavery*, p. 113, *end*, and p. 114; *ibid.* p. 106.

9. With the Hebrew, the law in favour of the slave could not be evaded, because there was one rule for the reception of the evidence of both master and slave in the courts of judicature.

With the Negro, the law in favour of the slave cannot be enforced, because the testimony of a slave is not received; and he has consequently no appeal to the judicature but through the medium of his oppressors. *Negro Slavery*, p. 106; *ibid.* pp. 2, 3, 4, 5. *Brief View*, *clauses 13, 14, 15*.

10. With the Hebrew there was one law of evidence alike to Jew and Gentile, to bond and free.

With the slave-holder, evidence against a black is received without oath; that of blacks against whites is not

accepted, though sanctioned by the most solemn oaths. *Negro Slavery*, p. 33, clause 4, to p. 34; *ibid.* p p. 2 to 5, and p. 106.

11. With the Hebrew, as fared the master so fared the slave. The master was not to have fine bread, and the slave coarse; nor yet old wine, and the slave new; nor a soft bed, and the slave straw.

With the Negro, his bed is a board, his habitation a hovel, his food mostly the cheapest that will sustain life. *Negro Slavery*, p. 7, clause 1; *ibid.* p. 86, clause 2; and p. 87, clause 2.

12. With the Hebrews, home-born slaves formed the strength of the family; they were carefully educated, placed in situations of the highest trust, and trained to arms.

With the Colonists, from the neglect of moral and religious instruction, and the almost total disregard of the institution of marriage, the children are few in comparison with the existing population; and of that reduced number a large proportion perish, who would be raised by parents who were united by marriage. Negroes are precluded by law from the benefits of education; they are not trusted, and are restricted, under severe penalties, not only from bearing arms, but from carrying so much as a stick. *Negro Slavery*, p. 17, clause 4, to end of clause 6, over leaf. *Negro Slavery*, p. 5, clause 2; *ibid.* pp. 75 and 76.

13. With the Hebrews, St. Paul tells us, the slaves differed in no respect from sons, except in heirship.

With the Colonist, they are roused by the cart-whip, and treated as beasts, and are stated to be mostly disfigured by the marks of the lash. *Negro Slavery*, p. 32, clause 2; *ibid.* p. 33, clause 2; *ibid.* p. 72, clause 2. *Negro Slavery*, p. 81, last clause, to p. 84; also note to p. 82; *ibid.* p. 102, clause at the end of the page; note, p. 103, and all p. 104; *ibid.* p. 106, last clause.

14. With the Hebrews, it appears that the elders of a city did not disdain to go on a deputation to obtain the cure of a sick slave.

With the Colonists, the maladies of their slaves are often rendered incurable by compelling them to work whilst they ought to be under medical care, and by refusing them the rest, maintenance, and medicine necessary to their restoration. *Negro Slavery*, p. 76 to 83.

15. With the Hebrews, no man might purchase a Hebrew female slave, but by the will of her father; nor even then, unless he laid himself under an obligation to marry her.

With the Colonist, such a sanction is seldom heard of. *Negro Slavery*, p. 53, clause 4, all. *Negro Slavery*, p. 73, clause 4; *ibid.* p. 86, clause 2. *Negro Slavery*, p. 112. *Brief View*, p. 1, clauses 9, 10, 11, 12.

16. Unbecoming conduct on the part of a Hebrew master to a female slave of the idolatrous Gentiles, immediately emancipated her.

It has been repeatedly stated that the conduct of the slave-holder may, with equal impunity, exhibit the grossest profligacy and the most atrocious barbarity. *Negro Slavery*, p. 53. *Negro Slavery*, p. 112.

17. The Hebrew slave frequently intermarried in his master's family, and the most eminent princesses of Israel treated them as on an equality with themselves.

The Negro slave may not even serve himself at his barbarous master's shop; nay, not even appear before their common God in the same church. *Negro Slavery*, p. 24 to p. 27; *ibid.* p. 83, clause 4.

18. With the Hebrews, the master was not to let one day elapse on the purchase of a slave, without seeking his conversion to God; nor was he for a twelve-month to relax in his endeavours to win him to the truth.

With the Colonist, no such obligation exists, and it is at his option to debar his slave from the possibility of religious instruction.

19. With the Hebrews, the rest of the sabbath of the sabbatical year, and of the year of Jubilee, were assured to all slaves.

With the Colonist, the Negro is assured of no rest, until in that grave where *the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary be at rest; where they hear not the voice of the oppressor, and the slave is free from the master; Job, iii. 17, 18. Negro Slavery, pp. 47 to 52; ibid. p. 55, clause 2. Negro Slavery, p. 72, last clause; also pp. 73 and 74; ibid. pp. 112 and 113.*

20. With the Hebrew, it was obligatory to devote the sabbatical year to the instruction of the Gentile bondsmen amongst them, and to invite them to enter into covenant with God; and the magnificent structure of the court of the Gentiles, the wonder of the world, was a national provision, open to them at all times, for worship and instruction.

With the Colonist, it is not obligatory on the master to give the slave any religious instruction. There is no efficient national provision securing their religious teaching. Though the Athanasian creed of our national church publicly pronounces the doom of eternal damnation on those who have not that orthodox religious knowledge, our laws leave it at the option of every master to debar his slave from receiving that instruction, by which it can be alone acquired. *Negro Slavery, p. 55; ibid. p. 115, clause 2; ibid. p. 112.*

21. With the Hebrew, the slave who remained stationary in the same tribe to the second generation, inherited, and became incorporated into that tribe.

With the Colonist, the twentieth generation of the unhappy slave is still fettered by the same eternal bonds, and the only difference is the deepening debasement of

his moral and intellectual character, as the centuries of slavery roll on in hopeless succession, to that hour when the slave and the master shall meet before the judgment-seat of a righteous God. *Negro Slavery*, p. 3, clauses 2 and 3; *ibid.* p. 24, clause 2; *ibid.* p. 34, clause 2; *ibid.* p. 108, clause 2. *Brief View*, p. 2, clauses 2, 10, 11.

22. The Hebrew slave, though often a criminal, and forfeiting his liberty by the judicial sentence of his country and the law of God, went out with liberal gifts at the end of a few years. After a period of probation, in which new habits might be formed, he returned to his inheritance with undiminished prosperity in this life; and if originally a Gentile, had the benefit of a course of religious instruction, which opened to him the prospect of eternal glory in the next.

The African slave, though innocent, and though deprived of his liberty, in diametrical opposition to every right of man, of the law of God, and of every principle of British liberty, goes out again no more. He has no more hope in this life, nor is there any obligation on the master to give him that instruction which may beguile his hopeless condition by one glimpse of bliss hereafter: and it is at the option of the Colonist, by preventing all religious instruction, to render hopeless in the next world those whom he has reduced to despair in this. *Negro Slavery*, p. 55; *ibid.* p. 115; *ibid.* p. 112; *ibid.* p. 3; *ibid.* p. 74; *ibid.* p. 108.

23. With the Hebrews, slaves were the masters' strongest protection, and formed an armed guard for his defence.

With the Colonist, slaves are the masters' terror, and are ever forming insurrections for his destruction.

24. With the Hebrews, slaves were employed as stewards, merchants, officers, tutors, and in other offices of trust requiring a liberal education.

With the Colonist, slaves are occupied in the drudgery performed in other countries by beasts, and are by law and heavy penalties precluded from any education. *Negro Slavery*, p. 5, end of clause 2.

25. With the Hebrews, slaves were so happy, that after the time of their service was expired, they frequently remained with their masters.

With the Colonists, slaves are so miserable, that in order to escape from servitude, they perpetually rush by self-destruction to a grave, beyond which no religious instruction has ever taught them to hope. *Negro Slavery*, p. 9, clauses 1 and 2. *Negro Slavery*, p. 84, clause 1.

26. With the Hebrews, although slavery was temporary, and the slave exposed to no danger of life and limb, and in most cases a criminal, it was a duty enjoined by the law of God, not to denounce the runaway slave to his master; Deut. xxiii. 15.

With the Colonist, though slavery is perpetual, and though the slave is exposed to perpetual hardship, and to constant danger of life and limb; and though he be in most cases innocent, it is constituted a crime by the law of man, *not* to denounce the wretched runaway to the merciless tyrant who, contrary to every Gospel precept, calls himself his master. *Negro Slavery*, pp. 90, 91, 92, to p. 97.

We have now compared the conduct of the modern, with that of the Hebrew slave-holder; we have contrasted the difference between slavery in the nineteenth century of the Christian æra, and slavery as it subsisted amongst the Jews, at a period three thousand years behind us in civilization, and from fifteen hundred to one thousand years before the light of the Gospel arose with healing in its beams.

If such be the contrast between the system allowed by Judaism, and that practised by the Colonist, where shall we find words to describe the gulf which severs that of the Colonist from that of the Christian?

Happily, it is not like that of Dives, an impassable one !

If the Hebrew be commanded under the old covenant to treat his slave kindly, to release him with gifts, and only to purchase those justly condemned for debt, the Christian of the new covenant recognises a very different mode of purchase.

We too, like the bankrupt Hebrews, are debtors, and have not wherewith to pay ; we too, like them, are purchased in consequence of debt, but *one is our master, even Christ.*

He who has made of one blood all the nations of the earth, he who is the Father of spirits, and who has declared that we are brethren, hath purchased us all with his own blood ; Acts, xx. 28. We were redeemed not with silver and with gold, but with the precious blood of Christ himself ; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. Seeing then that we are not our own, but that we are all equally bought with a price, let us henceforth live to him who died for us, and who set us an example, that as he hath loved us, so should we also love one another. Let us then, henceforth, as all equally the purchased servants of Christ, our kinsman and Redeemer, love each other as brethren of our common Lord ; and as he loved us, and gave himself for us, purchasing us with his blood, when we were yet sinners, so may we English, who profess to be bible Christians, ever practise that system of bonds, the only one which our Lord himself teaches us, viz. that of drawing the Negro Gentile, as well as the instructed Christian world, with the cords of love alone, which the Spirit of Christ our Purchaser, has emphatically described as being the BONDS of a MAN.

APPENDIX.

INTRODUCTION.

It has been already stated, that the inhabitants of the Holy Land were divided into two primary* classes, the ISRAELITES and the STRANGERS.

The ISRAELITES were the descendants of Jacob : Rom. xi. 1 ; Exod. ix. 7 ; Lev. xxiii. 42 ; Phil. iii. 5 ; 2 Cor. xi. 22.

The STRANGERS were those inhabitants of the land whom the Israelites conquered when they took possession.

The strangers included the five lordships of the Philistines : 2 Sam. xv. 19, and the seven nations of the Canaanites ; see Jud. xix. 13 ; 2 Chron. ii. 17—compared with 1 Kings, ix. 15—22 ; and 1 Chron. xxii. 2, and 2 Chron. ii. 17, 18.

The appellation of STRANGER might, indeed, be used to all foreigners, 2 Sam. i. 13 ; and seems simply intended, as applied to the Canaanites and Philistines, to mark that they were accounted as such, and consequently incapable of being possessed of any landed property. They were, however, frequently termed, by way of discrimination, STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES, to distinguish them as residing in the land, in contradistinction to other sojourners who might casually visit the

* We use the term *primary*, because a third, though derivative class is formed of the strangers, who became Jewish proselytes ; these are, however, to be resolved into one of the foregoing primary classes, being included under the class of strangers before, and as Hebrews after, their entrance into the Jewish pale.

Holy Land ; *Exod.* xx. 10 ; *Deut.* v. 14 ; *Deut.* xiv. 21. They are sometimes termed STRANGERS THAT SOJOURN AMONGST you : *Exod.* xii. 48, 49 ; *Lev.* xix. 33, 34 ; *Numb.* ix. 14 ; *Numb.* xv. 14, 15, 16 ; *Lev.* xvii. 8, *Lev.* xvii. 10, *Lev.* xvii. 13, *Lev.* xxv. 45, *Lev.* xxv. 47 ; *Numb.* xxxv. 15 ; *Lev.* xvi. 29, *Lev.* xvii. 12, *Lev.* xviii. 26, *Lev.* xxv. 6 ; *Numb.* xix. 10 ; *Josh.* xx. 9 ; *Ezek.* xlvi. 22, 23.

They were also frequently termed SERVANTS, or BONDSMEN, probably because they paid a certain tribute to the Jews, or else performed a certain quota of public labour : *Josh.* ix. 11 ; *1 Sam.* iv. 9 : the term SERVANT, in Scripture, as applied to a nation, meaning not a domestic, in our sense of the term, but simply a tributary : see *Gen.* xlix. 15 ; *1 Sam.* xvii. 8, 9 ; *2 Sam.* viii. 2, 6, 14 ; *2 Sam.* x. 19 ; *1 Kings.* ix. 21 ; *1 Kings.* iv. 21 ; *Josh.* xvi. 10, *Josh.* xvii. 13 ; *2 Kings.* xvii. 3 ; *2 Chron.* xvii. 11 ; *Matt.* xvii. 25.

An idea has very generally prevailed, that the wars of the Jews against the strangers were wars of extermination. Another notion, though perfectly contradictory of the first, has likewise prevailed, viz. that the descendants of these nations were reduced to a state of the most abject personal slavery. Both of these notions are erroneous. We shall endeavour to point out the facts which demonstrate their fallacy.

The first Section, which includes a brief sketch of the history of the Philistines and Canaanites, is meant to prove that the Jewish wars were not wars of extermination.

The second Section is an essay on the state of these nations under the Jewish theocracy. The bond service of Babylon, and that of Egypt, were very far removed from what we term slavery. We trust it will plainly appear, that the bond-service imposed on the Canaanite and Philistine strangers, was as far removed from the bondage of Egypt, as that was from the horrors of

colonial slavery; and that, in fact, the strangers of Palestine were entirely free, except in the article of tribute, and being precluded from the purchase of a permanent inheritance in land.

SECTION I.

SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE PHILISTINES AND CANAANITES.

HAM had four sons, Cush, Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan; Gen. x. 6.

The sons of Cush, Ham's eldest son, were Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Ramah, Sabtechah, and Nimrod, of which the sons of Ramah were, Sheba and Dedan: Gen. x. 7.

The sons of Mizraim, Ham's second son, were Ludim, Anamim, and Lehabim, Naphtuhim, Pathrusim, and Caslubim; from the last of whom are descended the Philistines, or Caphtorim; Gen. x. 13, 14.

Of the descendants of Phut, Ham's third son, we hear nothing.

Canaan, Ham's fourth and youngest son, had eleven children, viz. Sidon, Heth, Amalek, and the fathers of the Jebusite, the Arvadite, the Amorite, the Zemarhite, the Gergashite, the Arkite, the Sinite, and the Hamathite; Gen. x. 15—18.

Hence it appears that the Philistines were descended from Mizraim, the second son of Ham; and the Canaanites, from Canaan, his fourth son. We shall therefore speak first of the former.

The PHILISTINES were originally an Egyptian tribe. They emigrated from Egypt to Palestine, and established themselves in five lordships, along the coast of the Mediterranean; which is, on this account, frequently termed in Scripturc, the Sea of the Philistines. These lordships

were, Gath, Gaza, Ashdod, Askelon, and Ekron. The Philistines were originally called Caphtorim, being the remnant of Caphtor, which they probably abandoned on their emigration; but they afterwards adopted the name of Philistines: Amos, ix. 7; Jer. xlvii. 4.

Caphtorim was the name given this people from the place whence they came; and Philistim, from the ancestors whence they traced their descent.

When the Philistines entered the Holy Land, the Canaanites were already in possession; for on their arrival they expelled the tribe of the Avites, a nation of the Canaanites, to settle in their room; Deut. ii. 23. They afterwards became so flourishing a colony, as to impart their name to the whole land; the coast between Jordan and the sea being called Palestine, after them; Exod. xv. 14.

The Philistines must have expelled the Avites, and settled themselves in the Holy Land, at a very early period, since they occupied the land in the time of Abram. We find him sojourning with Abimelech, king of Gerar, which was a city of Philistia, whose strength was even then so well established, as to possess a powerful host, of which Phicol was called captain: see Gen. xx.; also Gen. xxi. 32—34. Abimelech is termed *king of the Philistines*, Gen. xxvi. 1; and Gerar is mentioned as a city of Philistia, Gen. xxvi. 1, 6. The Philistines are spoken of throughout the whole of the 26th chapter of Genesis. We hear of them again in Exod. xiii. 17: it is there expressly stated, that God did not lead the Israelites through their country. So early as Exod. xv. 14, we find they had given their name to the land. In the time of Joshua, we hear, not of the king of the Philistines, but of their five lordships, extending from Sihor, the river of Egypt, even to Ekron; Josh. xiii. 2, 3: see also Judges, iii. 3. It is not very easy to form a distinct idea of their government: perhaps the five lords of the Philistines may be meant by their princes, spoken

of, 1 Sam. xviii. 30 : again, in 1 Sam. xxvii. 2, Achish is called king of Gath, which was one of the Philistine lordships, whereas their lords are distinctly spoken of, 1 Sam. xxix. 7.

The Philistines were, equally with the Canaanites, plunged in the grossest idolatry. They seem to have united in their profession of faith all the false modes of worship of their various neighbours. They lived, like the Phenicians, on the coasts of the sea, and with them they adored the fish-god Dagon, who had a magnificent temple erected in his honour at Ashdod ; 1 Sam. v. 1—3. With the Egyptians, they worshipped Beelzebub, the god of flies, and his temple was erected at Ekron ; 2 Kings, i. 2, 3, 4, 6, 16. At Gaza, as at Ashdod, Dagon was especially adored. It was in this city that Samson met with his end, in destroying the temple of that idol ; Judges, xvi. 21—30. Gath, so called probably from its wine or pomegranate presses, was celebrated for the worship of Rimmon, or the god of fruitfulness, who was typified by a pomegranate, which he held in his hand : this fruit was considered as a symbol of fertility, on account of the number of its seeds : the city was on this account often called Gath Rimmon. At the city of Bethshan, the Philistines, like the Egyptians and the Assyrians, worshipped the solar fire, to whose honour they destroyed many victims. To this deity, which was the first in rank of all their false gods, and to whom they often gave the name of Moloch, or *the king*, kine were peculiarly dedicated. It was probably upon the principle of confessing their god as doing homage to the God of Israel, that the Philistines sent back the ark drawn by milch kine, 1 Sam. vi. 7—16. We must bear in mind, that there was no branch of idolatrous worship which was not attended by a correspondent ritual, distinguished either by atrocious barbarity or horrible profligacy. It is needless to enter further into this disgusting subject. The language in which the various ceremonies and practices of idolatrous

worship are incidentally spoken of in the prophetic writings, abundantly discover their enormity.

Besides numerous objects of idolatrous worship, the Philistines, amidst other superstitions, were particularly addicted to soothsaying; Isaiah, ii. 6.

Such were the Philistines when the Israelites, under the banners of Joshua, took possession of the Holy Land.

The Holy Land was first promised to Abram, Gen. xii. 7, xiii. 15, and xv. 18—21; and to Jacob, Gen. xxvi. 3, 4: but in Exod. xxiii. 23—31, the bounds of the land were fixed from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean, and from Arabia to the Euphrates and Sihor: see Numb. xxxiv. 3—12; and Josh. i. 4.

These boundaries included the nations of the Canaanites, Exod. xxiii. 23; and the territory of the Philistines, verse 31. A distinct command was given to drive them out and dispossess them, verse 27—30, until the Israelites should inherit the whole of the land, verse 30. The Israelites were also commanded to make no covenant with them as a nation, or with their gods, but wholly to destroy their polity, verse 32. This command applied to the Philistines equally with the Canaanites, because the boundaries, mentioned as those of the land, included both the land of the Canaanites and the Philistine lordships.

The reason for their not being allowed to possess the land was, lest they should entice the Israelites into idolatry; Exod. xxiii. 33: in fact, the Israelites were frequently enticed to adopt their idolatrous practices; Judges, x. 6, and Exod. xxxiv. 12; and they were continually engaged in wars with the Philistines, under various leaders, especially Shamgar, Samson, and Saul, from the time of the entrance of the Israelites into the Holy Land, until that of David, who effectually subdued them; 2 Sam. v. 25. David took much gold from them, and from that time they were a completely conquered nation,

and subject to the Jews; but, although conquered, no attempt was made to destroy them. They were suffered still to remain in the cities belonging to their own lordships, and were probably permitted to elect governors amongst themselves, much in the same manner as the princes of the captivity amongst the Jews at Babylon. They obviously resided in their own territory; 2 Kings, viii. 1—3. That they were then a large and powerful body, appears by the army they raised against Jehoram, king of Judah, when, in conjunction with the Arabians, near Ethiopia, they entered Judæa and Jerusalem, rifled the king's palace of all its treasures, and carried away all his children and his wives; 2 Chron. xxi. 16, 17. Uzziah, likewise, made war upon them, they having endeavoured to shake off the Jewish yoke, and having fortified Gath, Ashdod, Jabneh, and other places; 2 Chron. xxvi. 6, 7. We again find them rebelling, and raising powerful armies in the reign of Abaz, with which they invaded the cities in the low countries, and the south of Judah, and succeeded in taking Beth Shemesh, Ajalon, Gederoth, and Shochu, with all its villages, and several other cities, with their villages; 2 Chron. xxviii. 18, 19. The Philistines are mentioned by Isaiah, in the same reign, as uniting with the Syrians in devouring Israel altogether, Isaiah, ix. 12. Even during the time of the prophet Jeremiah, it appears, not only that the Philistines were a large body of people, but that they retained their own kings or lords; see Jer. xxv. 20: nor were they completely vanquished and absolutely deprived of their own polity, until the time of Judas Maccabæus, about A. M. 3841, or B. C. 159. Even then they were by no means destroyed, for about sixty-five years after, Jannæus burnt their chief city, Gaza, and incorporated their whole nation with the Jews, to whose faith they became proselytes. But although the whole Philistine nation did not adopt

the Jewish faith until that time, yet very great numbers of individuals had been proselyted at different periods, and had become Hebrews.

That the Jews never entertained any intention of destroying the Philistines, is obvious from their whole history. Thus Obed Edom, in whose house the ark so long rested, and who is mentioned as having been so peculiarly blessed by God, was not an Israelite, but a Gittite, or Philistine of the lordship of Gath, 2 Sam. vi. 10, 11, 12: so that, whilst Uzzah, the Israelite, received a punishment for his presumption, Obed Edom, the faithful Philistine, though an inhabitant of the same lordship which sent forth Goliath to defy the armies of the living God, received an especial benediction; 2 Sam. xxi. 19. As we are expressly told *he was blessed by God, with all his household*, he could not have remained an idolater; 2 Sam. vi. 10—12. The faithful Itai is likewise mentioned, not as a Jew, but it is expressly stated that he was a stranger, a Gittite; 2 Sam. xv. 19; 2 Sam. xviii. 2. Nor were these solitary instances: David, we are told, had about his person a whole legion of Gittite guards, that is, of Philistine guards, of the lordship of Gath.

We trust that it has been sufficiently proved, that in the case of the Philistines the Jewish wars were not wars of extermination. We trace the five lordships of the Philistines from the book of Joshua to the time of the prophet Jeremiah: we find them a powerful nation, raising armies, and contending at various periods with the Jews, till within less than a century before the time of Christ, when their polity being completely extinguished by Jannæus, they were not destroyed, but proselyted to the Jewish faith, and became merged in the Jewish nation.

Thus have we traced their existence throughout the whole period of the Jewish theocracy.

It is probable that the Philistines, like the Phenicians, were well versed in maritime affairs : like them their position was on the sea-coast, and like them they worshipped Dagon, the fish-god. It seems probable that, being an Egyptian tribe, they might partake of the learning of the Egyptians. They excelled in metallurgy, and in sharpening and forging iron ; 1 Sam. xiii. 19—23.

It is proved that the Philistines were included in the appellation of strangers as well as the Canaanites, by the passage in which Ittai is mentioned, 2 Sam. xv. 19 : he is there said to be one of the strangers, after which he is denominated a Gittite.

The CANAANITES were eleven tribes, descended from the eleven sons of Canaan.

The territory of the Canaanitish nations extended, in the time of Moses, from Sidon on the north to Gaza on the south ; and from the salt Sea of Sodom and Gomorrah on the east, unto Lasha on the west ; Gen. x. 19. In early times it must have extended still further, and included the whole border of the Philistines unto the Mediterranean ; since the Philistines expelled the Avites, one branch of the original eleven nations of the Canaanites, in order to establish themselves in their land. From this circumstance it appears, that although the Philistines were in occupation of the land as early as the time of Abraham, the Canaanites were still more ancient occupiers of the soil.

As the borders of the Holy Land skirting the Mediterranean were denominated Palestine from the settlements of the Philistines, so the interior of the land derived its appellation of Canaan either from Canaan, the first occupier, or from the eleven tribes of his children amongst whom Canaan himself divided it ; each of whom soon became the head of a numerous clan or tribe. The name of the land of Canaan first occurs in Gen. xii. 5. The Canaanites are not only generally mentioned as inhabiting the land in the days of Abraham, Gen. xii. 6,

and xiii. 7; but their tribes are distinctly and repeatedly mentioned. They were at that period divided into ten tribes, viz. the Perrizites, Kenites, Kennezites, Kadmonites, Hittites, Rephaims, Amorites, Girgashites, Jebusites, and Canaanites; Gen. xiii. 7, and xv. 19—21. The reader will observe that ten tribes only are here enumerated instead of eleven, the Avites having been previously dispossessed by the Philistines. The ten remaining nations dwelt as follows:—The Kenites, Kennezites, and Kadmonites, east of Jordan—as the name of the latter tribe seems to denote. The other seven tribes inhabited to the west of the river Jordan, and occupied the land from Sihor, the river of Egypt, to Sidon. They were disposed in the following manner:—The Hittites, or sons of Heth, the Perrizites, Jebusites, and Amorites, resided in the mountainous hill countries of Judæa, southward. The tribe of the Canaanites dwelt in the midland, northward of the Philistines, between them and the Sidonians, extending to the Mediterranean west, and to the coast of Jordan to the east. The Girgashites lived on the eastern coast of the lake of Tiberias, or the sea of Galilee; and the Hivites occupied Mount Lebanon, under Hermon, in the land of Mizpeh and Gilead, northward.

These tribes collectively occupied the whole land from the river Sihor, of Egypt, unto the Euphrates; Gen. xv. 18—21.

The Amorites gradually became the most powerful and numerous clan, and extended their conquests beyond Jordan, over the Kadmonites. Hence probably it is, that in many instances their name is used to designate the whole of the Canaanitish nations: Numb. xiii. 29; Josh. ix. 1; Judg. iii. 3; Matt. viii. 28; Gen. xv. 16; Josh. xxiv. 15; 2 Sam. xxi. 2.

In the time of Moses, the eleven tribes into which the Canaanitish nation was originally divided, were reduced to seven, viz. the Hittites, Girgashites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perrezites, Hivites, and Jebusites:—the Kadmon-

ites having been conquered by the Amorites, the Avites having been expelled by the Philistines, and the Hivites being substituted for the Rephaims; Exod. iii. 8, Exod. xiii. 5, Exodus, xxiii. 23; Deut. vii. 1, Deuteronomy, xx. 17.

All these nations were plunged in the most deplorable and disgusting superstition and idolatry.

Amongst other gods, they worshipped Moloch, otherwise called Milchom: likewise Baal, Baal Peor, Rimmon, Ashtaroth, Thammuz, Baalzebub, Adramelech, and a variety of other idols, whose worship was a source of the most debasing profligacy and cruelty, which appears to have demoralized the whole land to the greatest degree.

Various warnings were exhibited by the Divine mercy to these infatuated people. The long sojourn of Abraham, whom the sons of Heth, or Hittites, were themselves compelled to acknowledge as a prince of God, Gen. xxiii. 6; the dwelling of Lot in the city of Sodom, as a preacher of righteousness; the terrible example of the overthrow of those ungodly cities; the patience and forbearance of the LORD in enduring them for four hundred years, whilst the children of Israel sojourned in Egypt: all these instances, and many more might be given, of the Divine long-suffering towards them: but *he that being often reprov'd hardeneth his heart, shall in the end be suddenly destroyed, and that without remedy.*

JEHOVAH, to whom the future is equally known as the present, foresaw the hardness of their hearts, and from a period as early as that of Abraham, he had been pleased to announce that these nations should one day be dispossessed on account of their wickedness, and that the land of Canaan should be taken from them and given to the posterity of Abraham; Gen. xii. 7, Gen. xiii. 7—14. This promise was renewed, mentioning not only the Canaanites generally, but likewise specifying each tribe

in particular; Gen. xv. 18—21, Gen. xvii. 8. It was also continued to Isaac; Gen. xxvi. 3; and to Jacob, Gen. xxviii. 13—15, Gen. xxxv. 12.

The period of four hundred years being at length elapsed, and the iniquity of the Amorites being now full, the Divine command went forth, and the same promise which had been made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was renewed to Moses, Exod. iii. 8, 17; together with a command that he would set out at the head of all the tribes of Israel, on their return to Palestine, and dispossess the Canaanites, and take possession of the land; Exod. iii. 8—10, Exod. iii. 17; also vi. 4—8; and xiii. 5. But the Jews were not only commanded to take possession of the land of Canaan in general; Numb. xxxiii. 51—55; Deut. xx. 17; but the very name of each nation inhabiting the Holy Land is distinctly specified. The Philistines are mentioned Exod. xxiii. 31, and the various Canaanitish nations in the same chapter, ver. 23, 28. Thus the land of the Perremites, which was promised to Abraham, Gen. xv. 20, is again included in the command to Moses; Exod. iii. 8—17, and xxiii. 23.

The Jebusites, who had been specified to Abraham, Gen. xv. 21, are likewise to be driven out as a nation, in the command given to Moses; Exod. xxxiii. 2; Exod. xxiii. 23; Josh. xxiv. 11.

The Hittites are by name included, not only in the promise to Abraham, Gen. xv. 21, but likewise in the command to Moses and Joshua; Exod. iii. 8—17, Exod. xiii. 5, Exod. xxiii. 23—33; Deut. vii. 1; Josh. i. 4.

The same observation may be made of the Gergashites. Their land was promised to Abraham, Gen. xv. 21, and the LORD renewed his promise to Moses, to drive them out; Deut. vii. 1; also to Joshua, Josh. iii. 10.

The same observations might be continued respecting the Amorites and Canaanites. All the Canaanitish nations were specified in the promise to Abraham; and every

nation mentioned in the promise to Abraham, was also distinctly included by name in the command reiterated to Moses.

The command of GOD given to Moses, was to dispossess them of the land they had so long polluted, as the theatre of their atrocious misdeeds; to destroy utterly their separate political existence as organized nations, and to give them no choice but that of quitting the land, or residing in it as foreigners having no freehold possession, and as tributary to the Jews—henceforth receiving the name, not of natives, but of STRANGERS OR SOJOURNERS, or of BONDSMEN.

All who did not humble themselves under the mighty hand of GOD, but resisted his chastisement by taking arms against the Israelites, were to perish by the sword. That the Canaanites might, however, yet have a full opportunity of making their peace with GOD, if repentant, and that they might be left without excuse if they resisted his just judgment, the Israelites were led about for forty years in the wilderness.* The Canaanites heard of the Exodus of the Israelites, of the Divine command issued to them to occupy the land of Canaan, and they perfectly knew that it was ratified by a stupendous miracle, in the destruction of Pharaoh, forty years before any requisition was made from them; see Josh. ii. 9—11: and when the Israelites journeyed through the wilderness, and at length reached the borders of Canaan, we are not to suppose that the pillar of fire which marched before them, and spread its light over the desolate wilderness; or that the manna which daily descended for the Divine support of the armies of Israel, were alone intended for their benefit. They were no doubt beneficently intended to carry an undoubted conviction to the Canaanites also, that their commission was truly one from GOD; Josh.

* The hardness of heart of the Israelites, which drew down on them this punishment, being the means in the hand of GOD of long-suffering and forbearance to the Canaanites.

ii. 9—11. And lest these nations might delude themselves with the idea that report had augmented the miraculous part of it, God vouchsafed to work two notable miracles, before the very eyes of the Canaanites themselves, viz. at the Israelites crossing the stream of the Jordan, and at the fall of the walls of Jericho. These prodigies must have carried a full conviction to the consciences of the Canaanites, that they were truly fighting against God, in taking up arms against his people Israel; Joshua, ii. 9—11.

The commands for the destruction of the Canaanites are chiefly contained in the following verses:—Exod. xxxiv. 11—17; Deut. vii. 1, 6; Numb. xxxiii. 51—56; Deut. vii. 16—25, Deut. ix. 3, Deut. xxxi. 3; Exod. xxiii. 23—33; Joshua, ix. 3—27; Numb. xxi. 1—3; Deut. xxxii. 34, Deut. iii. 1—6; Joshua, vi. 1—21. By a mutual comparison of these passages, it appears, that when the Israelites were brought into the land they went to possess, they were commanded to drive out and to dispossess the seven nations of the Canaanites.* They were to smite their fenced cities, and utterly destroy their

* The prevalent idea of the total individual destruction of the Canaanites appears to rest solely upon one verse, viz. Deut. xx. 16, which *would* bear that sense if read without reference to its context: it then reads thus—“*But of the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth, but shall utterly destroy them;*” namely, the Hittites, &c. &c. Read with its context, it stands thus:—“*When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it, and it shall be, if it make thee an answer of peace, and open unto thee, that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and shall serve thee; but if it will make no peace with thee, then thou shalt besiege it; and when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thine hands,*” the males are alone to be killed, if not a Canaanitish city; but if it be “*of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth,*” &c. That the context, which supposes an offer of peace to be first made, *does* apply to the Canaanitish cities, as well as to the others, clearly appears from Josh. xi. 20, where, after recounting the

garrisons, and to annihilate their political existence as a nation. They were to make no covenants with them, by which they should, upon any condition, allow either of their retaining the soil, or their political existence, or of their maintaining idolatrous customs. They were bound to destroy their altars, to break down their images and burn them, and to cut down and utterly burn their idolatrous groves;* Deut. vii. 1—5; Exodus, xxxiv. 1—17. Nor were the Jews ever to intermarry with them in such a manner that a Jew should enter a Canaanitish family: this was forbidden to the Hebrews from the beginning, lest they should fall into the idolatrous habits of the Canaanites. Thus Abraham forbid his steward, Eliezer, to take for Isaac a wife of the Canaanites; Gen. xxiv. 1; for they were forbidden to do after the customs of the Canaanites: Lev. xviii. 3. Isaac interdicted Jacob

destruction of many cities, it adds, “*For it was of the Lord to harden their hearts, that they should come against Israel in battle, and that he might destroy them utterly, and shew them no favour; but that they might destroy them, as the Lord commanded Moses.*” A plain proof this, that the command for their destruction rested entirely upon their refusing peace, and coming out to battle. Had it been an *unconditional* command, the Israelites would not have needed the plea of their coming out to battle to destroy them. We must also solicit the reader's attention to the distinction between destroying the *cities*, and the *nations* of the Canaanites. The command for destruction is only applied, under any case, to the fortified cities, not to the people inhabiting the land beyond their walls. I apprehend, that even this command of the total destruction of the resisting cities would bear a different aspect, if we bore in mind, that in most cases they were the sites of idolatrous temples, whose population probably consisted of few others than the priests, who assisted in the profligate rites of idolatrous worship; and that the women and children alluded to, were, in all likelihood, not other than the companies of debased persons of the same description, who are even in these times, attached in such numbers to the pagodas of eastern idolatry.

* There is a very curious and interesting paper on consecrated trees and groves, in Sir William Ouseley's Account of Persia: to this we would refer the reader.

from marrying a Canaanite, Gen. xxiv. 3, 4; and in the days of Moses, the Israelites are strictly forbidden, Deut. vii. 3, to intermarry with the Canaanites: also, Joshua, xxiii. 12; and are severely blamed in Neh. xiii. 27, for marrying strange wives.

A little consideration will however shew, that the restriction only meant that an Israelite was not to marry and be adopted into a Canaanitish or other family of the strangers; but any stranger in general, or stranger women, whose male relatives were slain in war, and who, becoming captives to the Israelites, were adopted into Jewish families as slaves, having embraced the Jewish religion, were very often married unto their master's Hebrew slaves, and not unfrequently to their masters. In either case, they became incorporated into the tribe in which they married; Deut. xxi. 10—13. And if the Hebrew, after being betrothed to his wife, did not like to marry her, he was obliged to send her out free; Deut. xxi. 13, 14. That the objection to intermarriages with strangers consisted solely in their retaining their old idolatrous religion, appears from the decisive circumstance, that Moses, who gave forth the law against strange marriages, himself married an Ethiopian;* Numbers, xii. 1. We have observed that the Canaanites were entirely to be dispossessed, Deut. vii. 2; Numbers, xxxiii. 52—56; Judges, xi. 21—23; and that they were to be completely

* Bathsheba was first married to Uriah, a HITTITE, and secondly, to David, an ISRAELITE. Whether we suppose Bathsheba herself to have been of the Hittite, or Jewish race, it in either case proves that an Israelite might marry a proselyted Canaanite. It may, however, probably be objected to this instance, that it was accompanied with so foul a transgression of the moral law, that we can scarcely suppose that the political law was more exactly observed in the subsequent marriage of David to Bathsheba. To this we reply, that it is the treacherous conduct of David, previously to his marriage, for which alone he is reproved by Nathan; and as a judgment for which, perpetual war is denounced upon his household. Had the marriage of David, subsequently to Uriah's death, been illegal, it does not appear from the

driven off the soil; Exodus, xxiii. 28—33; Exod. xxxiv. 11—24; and xxxiii. 1, 2; Numbers, xxxiii. 52—55; Deut. iv. 38; Deut. ix. 1—7; Deut. xi. 23—25; Deut. xviii. 12; Joshua, xvii. 18; 2 Chron. xx. 7; Isaiah, xlv. 2; Joshua, xxiii. 9; 1 Chron. xvii. 21: their kings and their rulers were to be delivered into the hands of the Israelites, and their names, as distinct and independent nations, were henceforth to be blotted out from under heaven, Deut. vii. 21—24, lest they should entice the Jews into their idolatries.* But it appears from Joshua, xi. 19, 20, that this extermination was only to take place in case the Canaanites attacked them, or refused peace. It will be observed, that some of the texts we have quoted, command that the Canaanitish nations should be destroyed, and it has hence been often supposed that the LORD commanded they should all be slain. Dr. Adam Clark very sagaciously observes, in his comment on Deut. xx. 17, that the Hebrew word *חרם* may equally mean destroyed,† as a body politic, or destroyed, individually. Since the word will equally bear two senses,

character of Nathan, that he would have found more difficulty in calling upon David to dissolve it, than Ezra found in calling on so large a part of the Jewish nation to put away their idolatrous Babylonish wives. Nothing of the sort is attempted by Nathan. The child of David indeed dies, which might have afforded a peculiar facility for dissolving this marriage: yet so far from it, that amongst all the sons of David, Solomon, the son of Bathsheba, is chosen to succeed him on the Jewish throne.

* The reason given for destroying the city, whilst the inhabitants of the land were spared, strengthens the presumption that the order was given because the cities were in an especial manner sites of idolatrous worship.

† The scriptural sense of these expressions is peculiarly striking in the case of Amalek. No denunciations against the Canaanites are more explicit than those against the Amalekites:—"The Lord said unto Moses, write this for a memorial in a book, rehearse it in the ears of Joshua, for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven;" Exod. xvii. 14. Again, Balaam denounces, in Numb. xxiv. 20, *Amulek, the first of nations; but his latter end shall be that*

it seems obvious, that to determine which is the true one, we must refer to Scripture, and examine how in truth the faithful Israelites understood the command, and what

he perish for ever! A Divine command is given, Deut. xxv. 19, *When the Lord thy God hath given thee rest from thine enemies round about, thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven, thou shalt not forget it*: accordingly, Samuel gives the following command to Saul, 1 Sam. xv. 2, 3; *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, remember what Amalek did unto Israel! now go, and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not, but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.* Accordingly it is said, verse 7, *Saul smote the Amalekites, and took Agag, king of the Amalekites, alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword.* We apprehend it might here be understood, with equal propriety, as in the case of the Canaanites, that all the Amalekite nation, except Agag, were slain, especially on comparing this passage with Saul's declaration, 1 Sam. xv. 20; *I have obeyed the voice of the Lord, and have brought Agag, the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites.* Samuel afterwards slays Agag, xv. 33, and those persons who conceive the destruction spoken of was an individual destruction, might infer that not one Amalekite was left. This conclusion is however so false, that, 1 Sam. xxvii. 8, we find David at war with the Amalekites; in 1 Sam. xxx. 1, an Amalekite army invading the south of Judæa, conquered and pillaged the city of Ziglag, and set it on fire; after which David pursued them and obtained a signal victory. The first verses of the 1st chapter of the second book of Samuel, pursues the subject, and on comparing the two passages, it appears that they had a very large army, since David smote them from twilight one day to the evening of the next; 1 Sam. xxx. 17. Yet this happened only twenty-three years after their UTTER DESTRUCTION by Saul. They are again smitten, 1 Chron. iv. 43, and the people are declared to be remaining until that day, that is, till the time of Ezra. Accordingly, we find them mentioned in the interval between David's conquest over them, and the time of Ezra. Amalek is spoken of as confederating with other nations, Psalm lxxxiii. 7; and we are expressly told, in the book of Esther, that the enmity of Haman to the Israelites was grounded on his being an Amalekite of the race of Agag; Esther, iii. 1—10.

This instance, we apprehend, makes it perfectly clear, that it is NOT an INDIVIDUAL destruction of the whole nation which is ever intended in Scripture, but rather a destruction of fortresses or cities, which were the sites of idolatrous worship, with their inhabitants.

course of action was sanctioned by God himself. This test clearly shews that the Canaanites had the choice of fleeing or of becoming tributary; and that their cities were to be exterminated only in case they resisted the Divine decree.

Accordingly many quitted the country. We are informed by Strabo, that a pillar of memorial was erected in a remote part of Africa, with this inscription:—" *We are of the remains of the Canaanitish nations, driven out by Joshua, the robber.*" That the numerous Canaanites who remained in the land, had no possession left in the soil, appears from the division of the whole territory amongst the twelve tribes of Israel. That the Israelites only understood the command of extermination to apply in case of resistance, clearly appears from Joshua, xi. 19, 20; in which the attack of the Canaanitish kings is mentioned as the cause of their destruction. As a proof that the Jews did not consider themselves obliged individually to destroy the Canaanites, we need only mention the case of Rahab and her household, and that of the whole Gibeonitish nation. It is obvious that both these contracts would have been completely null and void, had the Jews been under a previous obligation to God to destroy these persons. But this system of mercy was not peculiar with respect to the Gibeonites. Although the Scriptures record the absolute destruction of many kings and fortified cities, they are careful, in every instance, to declare the inhabitants as commencing the war on the Israelites, and with the exception of these peculiar garrison towns, the Canaanites at large seem to have remained perfectly unmolested amongst their conquerors, on condition of paying tribute. This fact is recorded concerning almost every tribe of Israelites; and in the account given of the division of Palestine to the twelve tribes of Israel, mention is made in almost every tribe, of the Canaanites whom they received to tribute; see Joshua, xiii. 13.

Thus we find the Jebusites dwelling with the children

of Israel at Jerusalem, Joshua, xv. 63; Judges, i. 21; the Canaanites dwelling in Gezer, and amongst the Ephraimites, and received to tribute; Joshua, xvi. 10; Judges, i. 29. In the same way the Canaanites dwelt in the tribe of Manasseh, and when that tribe waxed strong, they neit^r destroyed nor drove them out, but only put them to tribute; Joshua, xvii. 12, 13. Zabulon did not drive out the Canaanites, but made them tributaries; Judges, i. 30; likewise Ashur, Judges, i. 31, 32; also Naphtali, Judges, i. 33; nor the tribe of Dan, who indeed were conquered by the Amorites; Judges, i. 34—36.

Hence it appears that the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Manasseh, Ephraim, Zebulon, Asher, Naphtali, and Dan, all allowed the Canaanites to remain amongst them; and we are told, Joshua, xvi. 10, that *the Canaanites dwelt amongst them, and were put to tribute*. Lest we should imagine that it was only the weakness of the Israelites that occasioned this permission, we are informed, Joshua, xvii. 13, and Judges, i. 28, *Yet it came to pass, that when the Israelites were waxen strong, that they put the Canaanites to tribute, but did not utterly drive them out*.

Notwithstanding the whole land was divided to the Jews by lot in the time of Joshua, the pristine inhabitants were so far from being exterminated, that in the third chapter of Judges they are all enumerated as then dwelling in Canaan. All the five lordships of the Philistines, and the seven Canaanitish nations, are particularly mentioned; Judges, iii. 1—5. If the Jews understood the command to destroy the Canaanites, as an *individual*, and not as a *political* destruction, it seems inexplicable why Joshua, who declared that *he and his house would serve the Lord*, Joshua, xxiv. 15, should have spared Rahab, should have received the Gibeonites, a branch of the powerful nation of the Amorites, into his protection; and should have engaged in a bloody war with five kings of the Amorites, besides a number of other kings, solely in

defence of this very Canaanitish tribe; see all Judges, x. xi. xii.; and that, to sum up the whole, he should, after all, have left every tribe of the Canaanites, and every lordship of the Philistines, unextirpated. Can this be accounted for, but on the supposition that only the fortresses and troops were to be destroyed, and that the driving out commanded by Jehovah, was only a driving out from the possession of the land, not an interdiction from dwelling there. Nor does it ever seem to have entered into the mind of the most prosperous of the Jewish sovereigns, to destroy these people. In the time of David, and under the magnificent reign of Solomon, we still find all the nations of the Canaanites enumerated, as dwelling amongst the Israelites. David gathered together the strangers that were in the land of Israel, 1 Chron. xxii. 2, and Solomon added to the tribute, or rather commuted the tribute imposed on the Canaanites at their first settling on the land, for a levy of bond-service. “*All the people that were left of the Amorites, Hittites, Perremites, Hivites, and Jebusites,* which were not of the children of Israel, upon those did Solomon levy a tribute of bond-service unto this day; but of the children did Solomon make no bondmen;*” 1 Kings, ix. 20—22. We are also told, 2 Chron. ii. 17, 18, that *Solomon numbered all the strangers that were in the land of Israel, after the numbering wherewith David his father had numbered them, and they were found to be 153,600; and he set 70,000 to be bearers of burdens, and 80,000 to be hewers in the mountains, and 3600 overseers to set the people to work in building the Temple;* 2 Chron. ii. 17, 18. Now if we compare these passages, it will appear, that in this

* It will be observed, that in this enumeration two tribes of the seven nations are omitted, viz. the Canaanites and Gergashites. They still, however, subsisted, for the cities belonging to the Canaanites are mentioned in David's enumeration of Israel; 2 Sam. xxiv. 7.

The Gergashites, or Gergesenes, are spoken of in the Gospels, Matt. viii. 28.

enumeration, only the strangers of the Canaanites, and not those of the Philistines, were included, though both were bondsmen; Lev. xxv. 46. As the enumeration of strangers exactly accords with that of bearers of burdens, hewers of wood, and overseers, it will also appear, that it could only include males, and those in the prime of health and strength—say from twenty to fifty. Now, even if all the Canaanites of that description were so occupied, we can scarcely allow, including the proportionate number of children, old men, invalids, and females, less than six times the number for the whole Canaanitish population; so that Palestine, a country scarcely equaling in size one quarter of England, must have contained one million of Canaanites, at the lowest computation. But that this enumeration might be doubled, seems probable from the following circumstance: all the Nethinims, who were the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Temple, and who, like the priests, served there in courses; and all menial servants, none of whom were Hebrews; likewise, almost all handicraftsmen* were strangers: consequently, a very large extra number of men, in the prime of their age, must be allowed for them, and a proportionate allowance for their families. If to the Canaanites we add the strangers of the Philistines and their five lordships, and bear in mind the armies which they were so frequently raising, we shall soon be convinced, that so far from the strangers being extirpated, it would, perhaps, be difficult to suppose them less in number than between three or four millions. Indeed, were they not a numerous and powerful body, it seems difficult to account for the great bulk which they occupy in the code of Jewish law.

Another circumstance we must remark. The author of the book of Kings states, in the passage quoted, that

* For though many of the latter were employed on Solomon's public works, it is yet obvious that a very large proportion of artisans must have been occupied in supplying the daily wants of the community.

the tribute raised by Solomon upon these people, remained "*to this day ;*" and the writer of the book of Chronicles transcribes the passage, 2 Chron. viii. 8 : hence, the tribute, though levied in the days of Solomon, must have been continued on the Canaanitish nations until the day of the author of the book of Chronicles. But that book includes the period of the Babylonish captivity ; it must therefore have been written posterior to that time. It has been generally ascribed, both by Christians and Jews, to Ezra : if so, it proves that the Canaanitish nations, so far from being destroyed, were existing in his time ; and whoever may be the author, they were in existence posterior to the Babylonish captivity.

Possibly, however, it may be thought, that although the Jews did not, in point of fact, destroy the Canaanites, yet, that they ought to have done so ; and that their omission in this respect was only one more, added to the numerous instances of the disobedience exhibited by that stiff-necked people.

Permit us, then, to give the reasons on which we think a contrary conclusion must be grounded.

If the league which Joshua made with the Gibeonites, a branch of the Amorites, had been contrary to a prior command of God, is it to be supposed that he would have winked at so gross an act of disobedience ? Would he have connived at the escape of the whole Gibeonitish nation, whilst he sent the prophet Samuel to enforce to the very uttermost his decree against Amalek ? and that, although Saul had given their prince a full expectation of mercy ? But we find Jehovah so far from annulling the act of Joshua, that he repeatedly sanctioned it, even by miracle. We are told that, many centuries after the time of Joshua, Saul having slain, or rather *sought* to slay, these people, in his zeal for Israel and Judah, *the Lord brought a famine of three years upon the land*, as a judgment on the Israelites, for the sin of their hearts ; nor

was it stopped, till seven of the sons of Saul, king of Israel, had been given up to execution, on account of their intention in exterminating these Canaanites; 2 Sam. xxi. 1—9. It is a very remarkable and unanswerable fact, that so far from having commanded the individual extermination of the Canaanites (unless where they resisted the Divine decree for the Israelites occupying the land), the most stupendous miracle that ever was wrought, viz. the standing still of the sun on Gibeon and the moon in Ajalon, was wrought by God, in favour of the Gibeonites, a branch of the Amorites, the most powerful of all the Canaanitish nations; and Joshua's war with the five kings, and afterwards with thirty others, was undertaken solely in consequence of the request of the Gibeonites to their Jewish allies, to defend them against the other Canaanitish nations who had attacked them; see Joshua, x. 1—34; Joshua, xi. all; Joshua, xii. all. The slaughter of the Canaanites was indeed great, but it will be seen that it was in every instance occasioned by resistance on their part to the occupation of the country by the Jews: the destruction fell upon those cities alone, whose inhabitants being acquainted with the Divine command, which had transferred the land to the Jews, and knowing it to be sanctioned by miracle, yet refused to comply, and to submit to the judgment which their long-continued sin had drawn down upon them. That the God of Israel was not understood by the Jews to have commanded the individual destruction of the nations of the Canaanites, is obvious from the circumstance of their being all employed in building Solomon's Temple. It is impossible to suppose that Solomon would have presumed upon such an act of impiety, as to employ in the very building of the Temple, persons whom he knew that God, to whose honour it was dedicated, had sentenced centuries before to extermination. It is even yet more extravagant to suppose, that had this building been thus erected in defiance of the Divine will,

the Deity should have vouchsafed by miracle to manifest his approbation, and to place his shekinah in its sanctuary.

The Nethinims, a body of persons who devoted themselves to the service of the Levites and priests, and who like them were free from taxes, are generally supposed to have been Hebrew proselytes of the Gibeonites. This idea is probably grounded upon the offer made by this nation, of becoming hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, combined with the declaration of Jewish writers: they say, these persons constituted the Nethinims, and they ascribe to their use four rooms in the corners of the court of the women in the Temple, where the Nethinims used to worm, to peel, and put up the wood used for the temple service. If this opinion be true, it is then obvious, that so far from commanding an individual destruction of the Canaanites, the Lord not only permitted the strangers to build his Temple, but to join his covenant; and being so joined, to assist in its service. It is probable too, that the Nethinims formed but a very small portion of the Canaanites who became Jewish proselytes, and thus melted away and were absorbed in the Jewish nation. When we consider the severity of the Jewish laws against idolatry, on the one hand, and the laws for the instruction of strangers, and especially of servants on the other, when, added to the operation of these external means, we consider, above all, the moral force of truth, which is ever accumulating strength, and the weakness of error, which progressively loses ground, we can scarcely conceive it possible that a very large proportion of the Canaanites should not have been amalgamated with the Jewish nation long before the time of Solomon. If so, his enumeration of the strangers of the Canaanites, men between twenty and fifty, who were proselytes of the gate, did not probably represent half of the whole nation; for many, no doubt, remained secret idolaters, and were not included in the enumeration. Great numbers, by joining the Mosaic covenant, had

long ceased to be reckoned amongst strangers; thus Uriah was a Hittite, Obed Edom and Ittai were Philistines; yet we can scarcely imagine these persons to have occupied such high offices of trust, unless they were Jewish proselytes. The same may apply to David's Hittite guard, 2 Sam. xv. 18: David would scarcely have selected six hundred men for his body guards, for his general officer, and above all, as the guardian of the ark of God, persons, all of whom God had commanded to be exterminated. But the grand, and, as we apprehend, absolutely exclusive fact proving that God never did issue such an unconditional command, is the very large portion of the Mosaic law devoted to the subject of the STRANGERS and SOJOURNERS. This law was promulgated by God himself; it was sanctioned by miracle, amidst the thunders of Mount Sinai: a blessing attended its performance, and a curse was denounced on its infraction. Now, would JEHOVAH have set forth a large and full body of law concerning the conduct and condition of people who were to have no existence after the Jews entered the country? We must bear in mind, that the laws respecting strangers, were not laws formed by the Jews subsequently to their conquest of Palestine, because, upon trial, they found it impossible to expel the strangers. They were laws formed, not by men, but by God; they were formed, not subsequently, but previously to the Canaanitish wars; they were promulgated, not to the Israelites wearied under Joshua with a long state of hostility, but to Israelites under Moses, flushed with the hopes of victory before the encounter. Now the formation of such a body of laws is absolutely inexplicable, except on the supposition that it was the intention of God that a large and powerful body of strangers should dwell amongst his people, and remain subject to them.

As a parallel argument to this, we may draw another from the construction of Solomon's Temple—we say SOLOMON'S Temple, because the temple of Herod sub-

sisted when Palestine was overrun by Greek and Roman Gentiles. But in the period of the first temple, from Solomon's time to that of the Babylonish captivity, where were the concourse of worshippers habitually to occupy the court of the Gentiles, excepting the strangers who habitually dwelt in the land? We find no class of persons but these, whose numbers would have made it worth while to erect so vast a national work. For although the court of the Gentiles was called "*a house of prayer for all nations,*" and although it was no doubt resorted to for that purpose by pious Gentiles of every nation visiting Jerusalem, yet we can scarcely imagine, when travelling was so much more difficult than it now is, that it could ever have been greatly or habitually frequented, but by that vast body of strangers resident amongst the Jews, whose propinquity had been the means of enabling them to attend its services. When we consider the stupendous pile of buildings dedicated to the worship of the strangers, it is impossible, without the greatest extravagance, to conclude otherwise than that it must have been meant principally for the convenience of a vast body of people daily occupying it, not for the few insulated strangers and foreigners who might occasionally visit Jerusalem from distant countries. But if this opinion be well founded, it then follows, that the existence of the strangers amongst the Jews was in the Divine contemplation. Is it possible to charge the all-wise and merciful God with the glaring inconsistency of commanding the erection of a stupendous fabric, which has been the admiration of the world; of ordering a regular septennial instruction, and of framing a voluminous code of laws, for a people who were all to be exterminated before any one of these commands and provisions could be put in operation?

Having now, as we conceive, given satisfactory ground for the conviction that God never intended the unconditional extermination of the Philistines, or Canaanites, we shall proceed to the second branch of inquiry; viz. What

was the condition of the strangers, or bondsmen, under the Jewish polity?

This inquiry will still further throw light upon the subject, and exhibit a fuller confirmation of the foregoing chapter.

SECTION II.

STATE OF THE PHILISTINES AND CANAANITES UNDER THE JEWS.

It has generally been supposed that the Philistines and Canaanites were, under the domination of the Jews, reduced to a state of bondage analogous to what we term slavery. This idea, we hope to shew, is a mistaken one.

Both these people were included under the name of strangers. That the PHILISTINES were so called, appears from the circumstance of Ittai being so denominated; and it being afterwards stated that he was a Gittite, or Philistine of Gath; 2 Sam. xv. 19. That the CANAANITES are termed so, appears from the passage, 2 Chron. ii. 17, 18; 1 Kings, v. 13—18, where the strangers are mentioned as labouring in the erection of the Temple, compared with the passage which declares this labour to have been performed by the Canaanites; 2 Chron. viii. 4—9; 1 Kings, ix. 17—23. In the recapitulation of the fourth commandment, both in Exodus and Deuteronomy, these people are termed STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES.

They were also frequently, for the same reason, termed SOJOURNERS; Lev. xxv. 45.

It is necessary to prove to whom the designation of SOJOURNER and STRANGER is affixed, that we may understand to whom the laws concerning strangers apply.

Besides the appellation of STRANGERS, and SOJOURNERS, which are common both to PHILISTINES and CANAANITES, we shall find that they are frequently termed BONDSMEN; Lev. xxv. 46: *They shall be your bondsmen for ever*, that is, the STRANGERS: they are also termed SERVANTS. The Canaanites are called so, 2 Chron. viii. 9, compared with ver. 7 and 8; and the Philistines, 2 Sam. viii. 1, 2, 11, 12. These two latter expressions have probably been the means of giving rise to the false idea of the enslaved state of these nations. Persons are apt to include under these terms the ideas now annexed to them, forgetting that in ancient times they conveyed a totally different meaning, and implied an entirely different condition.

The term *servant* amongst the Hebrews, as applied to a nation, meant *tributary*; in proof of which assertion we refer to the following passages: Gen. xlix. 15; 2 Sam. viii. 2, 6, 14; 2 Chron. viii. 9, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20; Gen. xv. 13, Gen. xxvii. 29; Exod. i. 13, 14, Exod. xiv. 12; Deut. xx. 11, Deut. xxviii. 48; Judges, iii. 8, 14; 2 Sam. x. 19; 1 Kings, iv. 21, 1 Kings, ix. 21; Exod. xiv. 5; Josh. xvi. 10, and xvii. 13; 1 Kings, ix. 21; 2 Kings, xvii. 3; Matt. xvii. 25.

A comparison of these passages with each other and with their contexts, shews that the term *servant*, as applied to a nation, always implied being subject to tribute, and frequently to bond-service.

We must then inquire what was understood by BOND-SERVICE. The most rigorous bond-service we hear of in Scripture, was the bondage of Egypt: it was termed *cruel* bondage. The Israelites are said to have *served with rigour*; see Exod. i. 14, and ii. 23, and vi. 9; Deut. xxvi. 6: accordingly, a dreadful destruction overtook the Egyptians, as a punishment for their oppression. Nevertheless, although the bondage of Egypt was the most cruel bondage mentioned in Scripture; and although the Israelites are repeatedly warned to exact no such

bondage of their strangers; it yet plainly appears, that the Israelites in Egypt possessed the most fertile tract of country in the empire; that they had large* and commodious habitations, extensive crops, herds and cattle innumerable, and that they possessed all these things independently of the Egyptians; for we do not find, during the period of the ten plagues, which destroyed the cattle and crops of the Egyptians, that they ever imagined themselves entitled to take those of the Israelites. The twelve tribes exclusively possessed the land of Goshen, Gen. xlv. 10, and xlvii. 34, and xlvii. 4, 6, 27; Exod. viii. 22, and ix. 26; and it appears that they did not live dispersed amongst the Egyptians, Exod. viii. 22, but in one district, since they all escaped the flies, Exod. viii. 22; and the darkness, Exod. x. 23; the murrain, Exod. ix. 4—6; and the hail, Exod. ix. 26. They could not then be menial servants, or slaves, attached to particular owners, dwelling in their masters' houses. Accordingly, we are informed that they were occupied in public works, and probably remotely from their own homes, since they had no straw at hand, and since they were occupied in erecting various treasure cities.† All the Israelites were bondsmen, since none of the nation are mentioned as being excepted: yet none but a small part could have been labouring in the service of the Egyptians at one time, as during that period we find the land of Goshen having light in its habitations, which would have been useless, had they had no inhabitants; nor can we understand how their crops were raised, or their flocks cared for, unless the bulk of the people remained in the land at home.

The meaning of the term **BONDSMEN** must then be, that the whole nation were subject to a levy, each indivi-

* Which appears by the exhortation to invite their neighbour's household, if their's were too small to eat the paschal lamb.

† Pithom and Ramesses. The first of these words probably denotes *harbours and sea-ports*; and the second, *fortresses, or fortified cities*.

dual being obliged to furnish his quota of labour in turn to the public works of Egypt.

Accordingly, the same notion of bond-service prevailed in Judæa. The strangers were there decidedly not personal slaves to the Jews; for no Jew could keep a slave above a year, who did not embrace the Jewish faith. That strangers had possessions, over which they had independent control, although those possessions were not in land, appears clearly to have been the case, from their being constantly spoken of as paying tribute. If they had nothing, they could have paid nothing. The strangers were so far from necessarily being servants, that they were often rich, and became possessed of Hebrew servants; Lev. xxv. 47.

The Canaanite bondsmen became tributaries in the time of Joshua; Josh. xvi. 10, and xvii. 13; Judges, i. 30, 33, 35; Judges, i. 21, 27, 28.

The Philistines became what is termed servants, or bondsmen, in the time of David; 2 Sam. viii. 1, 2, 11, 12; 2 Chron. xvii. 11.

The tribute was renewed, and established on a permanent footing over the Canaanites, by Solomon; 2 Chron. viii. 7, 8. On comparing the last clause with the date of the writing of the book of Chronicles, it appears that the tribute still remained in force till the time of Ezra.

The Philistines were also subject to a tribute; see 2 Chron. xvii. 11.

In the case of the Canaanites, it appears as though, with respect to the poorer ones, the tribute was sometimes redeemed, or commuted for a certain quota of labour in public works. Thus king Solomon seems to have commuted the tribute he had imposed on them for four months labour in the year; 1 Kings, v. 14, compared with 2 Chron. viii. 7—10; and 1 Kings, ix. 15—23. Solomon employed 153,600 of the Canaanites in the most servile parts of the work of building his Temple, palaces, throne,

store cities, and fortified cities. It appears that Hiram,* the artificer of Hiram, king of Tyre, and his workmen, constructed the metal work for the Temple: which they cast in the clay ground near the river Jordan; 1 Kings, vii. 13, 40, 51. Hiram furnished Solomon with pine and cedar trees from Lebanon, and floated them down to Joppa; 2 Chron. ii. 16. From Joppa they were conveyed to Jerusalem, by the bondsmen of Solomon. These Canaanitish bondsmen were thus appointed:—70,000 were to bear burdens, 80,000 were hewers in the mountains, 3600 Canaanite overseers were established to direct and appoint their work; 2 Chron. viii. 1—9, 17, 18. These 153,600 labourers were not all employed at one time, but wrought in successive gangs of thirty thousand men; each gang working four months in the year; 1 Kings, v. 13—18. Adoniram is mentioned as being over the levy, which is called in the marginal reading *a tribute of men*; 1 Kings, v. 13, 14. If he is the person mentioned as being over the tribute, 1 Kings, iv. 6; 2 Samuel, xx. 24; 1 Kings, xii. 18; and 2 Chron. x. 18, it appears likely that it was the tribute of money, which was commuted for a tribute of service; see 2 Chron. viii. 7—10, and 1 Kings, ix. 15—23.

If we compare the account of the buildings of Solomon, with the compact of Joshua with the Gibeonites, it would appear that the poorer strangers were hewers of wood, drawers of water, bearers of burdens: and as the Hebrews might do no servile work,† Lev. xxiii. 7, 8, 21—25, 33, 35, 36; Numb. xxviii. 18—25, 26, Numb. xxix. 1, 12,

* This Hiram was the son of a Tyrian, who was a brass-founder, and his mother was a woman of the tribe of Dan, who were peculiarly skilful in works of dyeing, and embroidery. He was himself skilful to work in gold and in silver, in brass, in iron, in stone, in timber, in purple, in blue, in fine linen, and in crimson, and to engrave; 2 Chron. ii. 14.

† The reader will observe, that the texts quoted only forbid servile work at particular seasons; but as these were constantly recurring, and

35, it is probable many of the former were hired menial servants. From their having no possessions in the soil, compared with the circumstance that agricultural labour was one peculiarly exercised by Hebrew servants, it does not seem likely there were many Canaanites who exercised it. The term of STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES seems to designate their habitation to be in cities. Their occupations, as appointed by Solomon, suggest the idea that they must have been previously in the habits of such occupations, and indicate them as persons who usually employed themselves in handicraft labour; such as carpentry, joinery, stone-hewing and polishing, masonry, lapidary and goldsmith's work, weaving, dyeing, embroidery, architecture, &c. We have observed that in the levy of Solomon, 3600, who were persons probably of comparative wealth or education, were appointed as overseers. We are also told, that Solomon instituted a fleet, and sent his servants, accompanied by some of those of Hiram, a three years' voyage to Ophir and back. It seems probable, 2 Chron. viii. 18, and ix. 10, 11, that many of the bondsmen, probably the Philistines, who lived near the sea-coasts, and worshipped the fish-god, were sailors. Accordingly, when the prophet Jonah set out from Joppa, the ship was managed, not by Hebrew but probably by Philistine mariners, since *they each called to their god*; Jonah, i. 3, 5. A warning was given them of the complete subservience of the fish-god Dagon to JEHOVAH, by the mighty fish which God prepared to restore his prophet at his command, from the midst of the tempest; Jonah, i. 17, and ii. 10. Many of the wealthy Canaanites and Philistines were most likely merchants. We know that agriculture, and not merchandise, was

as servants could not conveniently be constantly changed, it seems likely that hired servants of the strangers should be employed. Accordingly the targums expressly declare that no Hebrews were to do servile work.

pursued by the Jews. But the fleets of Solomon, and Hezekiah suppose many of their subjects to be engaged in mercantile pursuits. The situation of the Philistines, the meaning of the name Canaanite, and the exclusion of these nations from agriculture, lead us to presume they must have furnished the persons who occupied themselves in that manner.

Many of the strangers became Jewish proselytes: some, no doubt, from their association with Jews, and many others from becoming purchased servants in Jewish families. Amongst the Hebrew proselytes, Hartwell Horne, and many others, have reckoned the body of persons called **NETHINIMS**, or *given*. These persons, though not Levites, or originally Hebrews, yet voluntarily gave themselves to the service of the priests and Levites who officiated in the temples. Like them, their attendance at the Temple was in courses of so many at one time. Like them they were free from all tribute; Ezra, vii. 24. They dwelt in the cities of Palestine, from its first conquest by Joshua; 1 Chron. ix. 2. They are, in the book of Ezra, mentioned next in rank after the priests, Levites, singers, and porters; and before the children of the priests. Dr. Prideaux, in his Plan of the Temple, marks the courts of the Nethinims as four in number, one being placed in each corner of the court of the women, where they prepared the wood and other materials used in the temple service.

The Hebrews were so far from esteeming it lawful to oppress strangers, that many, either strangers, or persons originally belonging to them, were raised to posts of high honour and trust. Thus Uriah, though one of David's thirty-seven celebrated worthies, was a Hittite; 2 Sam. xi. 3, 6, 17, 21, 24, and 2 Sam. xii. 9, 10, and 2 Sam. xxiii. 39; and 1 Kings, xv. 5.

The faithful Ittai, we have observed, was a Gittite, and the care of the ark of God itself, after the rash action of Uzzah, was, on its removal from Kirjath Jearim,

committed to Obed Edom, also a Gittite. Thus did David, the man after God's own heart, commit one of the highest military, the closest confidential, and the highest religious trusts, to three persons, all of whom, originally, were of the natives of the land : the first tracing his descent from a Canaanitish nation, and the two last being natives of one of the most powerful lordships of the Philistines. So far was the God of truth from permitting the destruction of the Canaanite and Philistine individually, that he visited the iniquitous death of the Canaanite, Uriah, most severely upon the king of his chosen people — nay, upon the most favoured of all its kings. And the household of Obed Edom, though a Philistine, is emphatically declared to have been blessed by God.

In every respect but that of holding land, or the highest offices in the state, Deut. xvii. 15, the strangers, on paying a tribute, were on the same level as the Hebrews. And whenever tribute labour was required, it was conducted and regulated by officers of their own nation.

There was one civil law to the Hebrew and to the stranger within his gates ; Exodus, xii. 49 ; Lev. xxiv. 22 ; Numb. xv. 15, 16, 29, Numb. ix. 14.

The slayer of the stranger was to die equally with the murderer of the Hebrew ; Lev. xxiv. 17—22.

The gleanings of the harvest were to be left equally for the poor Canaanite as for the poor Hebrew ; Lev. xix. 9, 10, and xxiii. 22, and xxv. 6.

The poor amongst the strangers were to be relieved equally with the poor of the Israelites ; Leviticus, xxv. 35—37.

The same impartiality was to be observed respecting judicial proceedings. *The stranger was not to be vexed or oppressed ; Exodus, xxiii. 1, 9, 12, Exodus, xxii. 21 ; Lev. xix. 33, 34.* The stranger was, moreover, to be treated kindly, Deut. x. 18, 19, and to have food and raiment given him ; and if any of the strangers came under the operation of those laws which imposed the

penalty of servitude on them, equally as on the Hebrews, they were also both equally protected in life and limb, by one and the same law. The strangers within the gates were, equally with the Hebrew, entitled to the benefit of the cities of refuge; Numb. xxxv. 15, and Joshua, xx. 9. The judges were commanded to judge righteously between the Hebrew and the stranger; Deut. i. 16; Lev. xxiv. 22. Severe judgments were denounced on those defrauding the strangers; Mal. iii. 5; Ezek. xxii. 7. Moreover, to sum up all in a word, the LORD commanded, Lev. xix. 32, 33, 34, 35, *Fear thy God, I am the Lord. If a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him; the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born amongst you, and thou shalt love him as thyself.* And again, in Deut. x. 17—19, *The Lord your God is a God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible, which regardeth not persons; he loveth the stranger, love ye therefore the strangers, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.*

THE STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES were equally entitled to property, excepting landed freeholds, with the Israelites. It appears, however, that they might possess lands, within the limits of cities, because they were there subject to sale, independently of the laws of inheritance, and reversion at jubilee; Lev. xxv. 29, 30. Thus we find David munificently paying Araunah, or Ornan, the Jebusite, for his threshing-floor, in the walled city of Jerusalem. Yet Araunah, the possessor of the land, was a Jebusite—that is, a Canaanite of one of the seven nations the Jews were commanded to expel; and whom David had finally conquered when he ascended the throne, and drove them out of the citadel of Zion, which he afterwards called the city of David; 2 Sam. v. 7, 9.

With respect to the religious privileges of the STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES, they stood on the same ground with those of every other Gentile nation.

So long as they remained without the Jewish covenant,

they were excluded from partaking of the passover, *Exod.* xii. 43, and xxix. 33; nor were they to eat of the holy thing, *Lev.* xxii. 10—15; nor were they to enter what (because only the holy nation might enter it) is often improperly termed the sanctuary, but which is rightly termed the court of Israel; see *Ezek.* xliv. 7—9, compared with *Jer.* li. 51, and *Zech.* xiv. 21.

The strangers were, however, all invited to worship the true God, by attending in the court of the Gentiles, or HOUSE OF PRAYER FOR ALL NATIONS. Persons imagining the condition of Negro slaves to be similar to that of the Gentile bondsmen of the Jewish theocracy, would do well to point out what law in any nation of Christendom is parallel to that which commanded the Jews to devote one year in seven, besides the weekly sabbath, and the year of jubilee, to the religious instruction of their bondsmen or strangers. Amongst the Jews, the national law of the land secured to their bondsmen both religious instruction, and the use of the most magnificent edifice of the world in which to perform their worship.

The superb structure of the court of the Gentiles, sufficiently marks the stress laid by the Divine law on the religious privileges of the strangers. It was the stupendous magnificence of this court more especially, which rendered the Temple of Solomon the wonder of the world. One side was raised in a terrace, four, or as some say six hundred feet in height, from the profound valley below. It was formed of prodigious stones, some of which were thirty-two feet long, by eighteen wide, and it was cased, from its base even to its summit, with polished white marble: so skilfully adjusted, that it is said that the joining of the stones could not be detected, even on the closest inspection.

This stupendous court was adorned with the richly wrought and spacious cedar galleries, supported by cloistered colonnades of the most costly materials, all the pillars of which were inscribed with moral and religious sentences; many of which are supposed to have been taken from the Psalms called *MASCHILL*, or *instruction*; and

those called MIGHTAM, *to be engraven*; and lastly, from those which more especially call on the Gentiles, and on all the earth, to praise God. All this magnificence, the glory of Solomon, was lavished, not on the courts of the favoured Israelites, which, not belonging to our subject, we have left undescribed, but on that of the Gentiles: to which were invited those strangers and bondsmen whose condition is continually urged (we leave it to the reader to pronounce with what truth) to have been similar to that of Negro field-slaves.

The following religious privileges and restrictions were secured, and imposed by the law of God, on the Gentile bondsmen or strangers within the gates:—

All remnants of idolatry were to be completely extirpated, throughout the land; Deut. vii. 1—26. The STRANGER WITHIN THE GATES was, equally with the Jew, to refrain from eating blood; Lev. xvii. 10—16. Like the Hebrews, they were put to death for blasphemy, Lev. xxiv. 16; like the Hebrews, they were subject to the restrictions, and entitled to the privileges of the Sabbath; Exod. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14; Exod. xxiii. 12; that is, if masters, they were obliged to *give*, and if servants, privileged to TAKE rest on that day, as likewise, in the sabbatical year. The STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES were allowed to present their offerings to God, Lev. xxii. 18, and Numb. xv. 4. In order to prevent the introduction of idolatrous rites, they were under the same obligation as the Jews, when they did sacrifice, only to sacrifice in the Temple of Jerusalem; Lev. xvii. 8, 9. Strangers were assured that their prayers, if looking towards the Temple, the place of sacrifice appointed by God, should, equally with those of the Jews, be accepted; 1 Kings, viii. 41—43, and 2 Chron. vi. 32, 33. The STRANGERS WITHIN THE GATES were to be invited to the feast of first-fruits, Deut. xxvi. 11—13, and to various other Jewish festivals. Those who were servants, were to be invited to all the sacrifices made by their master's family. The strangers were all to be earnestly solicited to enter into

covenant with God ; Deut. xxix. 10—13. In the year of release, during which agricultural labour ceased, they were to be diligently instructed in the law of God ; Deut. xxxi. 9—13.

The strangers, being once entered into the Jewish covenant, might partake of the passover, and indeed were bound by all the obligations and entitled to all the privileges of a Hebrew ; see Exod. xii. 43—48, and xxix. 33, and Numb. ix. 14, compared with Gal. v. 3.

On entering the Jewish church they ceased to be strangers, and commenced Jewish proselytes : in which case their children were to be adopted into the tribe in which they settled, and they were to have an inheritance therein ; Ezek. xlvi. 22, 23, and Prov. xvii. 2.

WE here close our extracts. We trust the reader is convinced, that—

1. God would never have given these detailed civil and religious laws, had he meant that the people to whom alone they apply, should cease to exist previously to the commencement of their operation ; and, 2. The law itself abundantly proves, that the condition of the strangers was in no respect similar to that of slaves, but more resembling that of denizens, or foreigners in our own country.

Many excellent persons, who attach themselves to a spiritual and typical interpretation of Scripture, maintain the notion of the destruction of the Canaanites, because they esteem these people typical of various sins : which, as they observe, should be wholly, not partially exterminated. To such persons we would say, that as a true typical, and true literal explanation of Scripture, can never be in contradiction to each other, we apprehend they are mistaken in their interpretation. It is surely very possible to give a valuable typical application, without the massacre of seven nations of Canaanites and five lordships of Philistines in its support.

If we consider that all sin depends, not upon the existence, but the insubordination, of natural propensities and faculties to the Spirit of God ; if we see that sin depends on the aboriginal inhabitants being dominant possessors of the soil, instead of being strangers in the land, under strict tribute to Him who is the Head of our theocracy ; if the evil consists in allowing them to sow the soil of the heart with tares, instead of being employed under Him, either in building the Temple, or furnishing, as menial servants, necessary labour in the wants of this life, we shall see, that even the spiritual Canaanites and Philistines need only be reduced to BOND-SERVICE, and not extirpated. Though they may indeed sometimes rise in rebellion, seek to entice us to idolatry, and thus occasionally *prove thorns in our sides* ; yet, if kept in due subjection, we shall find them most useful servants, and when proselyted to the service of the cross, most invaluable coadjutors. In this happy country, we are surrounded on all sides with the abundant fruits of their consecrated labours. Whether we muse on the pages of Milton, of Young, or of Cowper ; or that our spirits be entranced by the immortal strains of Handel, Graun, Mozart, or Haydn ; or whether we contemplate the venerable specimens of sacred Gothic architecture, consecrated by the piety of our forefathers, and which yet hallow our land, we still are indebted for them, to the devoted labours of the natural faculties and propensities. Nor do our various plans of religious, moral, and benevolent institutions, owe them less than the fine arts. The organized system of our schools of mutual instruction, our institutions for commencing the education of the heart, and formation of the habits of early infancy, and those for cultivating the hitherto hopeless, and long neglected waste of ignorant old age ; the various plans by which the enlightened and benevolent rich have assisted and enabled the labouring poor to save their hard-earned gains, and the instruction imparted to the ignorant, in prudently using them ; the various

institutions for healing the sick, for cheering the friendless, and affording temporary help, like the cup of cold water in due season, to refresh the stranger and wayfaring man, fainting beneath the heat and burden of his day; the missions sent forth from every tribe of our Israel, raising the peaceful banners of the Cross, from the frozen Arctic Circle, to the luxuriant tropical climes of the West Indies; and above ALL, the stupendous labours of that Society which has already diffused the Word of Life, and bade it flow through the channels of a hundred and sixty-five different languages, to irrigate the whole globe, until *the knowledge of the Lord cover the whole face of the earth, as the waters cover the sea*—All these, and various other institutions, not less the wonder of our age and country, might be adduced, as examples of the fruit of the dedication of natural talents to the service of the Cross. These tastes, faculties, and propensities, were the aboriginal and once the sole possessors of the soil of the human mind. They were once plunged in the basest idolatry: temples to Adramelech, the golden god; to Thammuz, the god of luxury; to Rimmon, the god of wine-presses; to Dagon, the god of successful merchandise; to Moloch, the god of war, whose abominable altars ever flow with human blood and reek with butcheries, defiled the land. Systems of false reasonings encompassed and sheltered the basest vices, and each favourite propensity grew unchecked, beyond all due proportion.

The cities of the Canaanites were walled up to heaven, and there were giants in the land; therefore, the inhabitants were to be driven out. The temples of idolatry, and the fortresses and walled cities, were to be utterly destroyed. The former inhabitants were no longer to be possessors of the soil, but were to be put to tribute, and to bond-service for ever; Lev. xvi. 46. Thanks be to God! may the church of Christ exclaim, they are now STRANGERS IN THE LAND: many are become proselytes, and the THAV, the spiritual sign of the cross, beams upon their forehead. They

have cheerfully given their quota of labour, they have wrought in associated companies diligently, both in the forests and in the mountains, at home and abroad, by sea and by land. Some have been the fellers of opposing forests, and quarriers of hard rocks ; many have been collectors of materials, many bearers of heavy burdens, and many others directors, planners, and overseers of their labours. Very many have given themselves as Nethinims, rejoicing to be hewers of wood, or drawers of water, in the service of the Temple. The faithful bondsmen have laboured, and *above all*, God has abundantly blessed their labours. His word commanded, His inspiring Spirit stimulated ! and already, the terrace of Solomon, the Prince of peace, is risen from the deep valley to the heights of Zion. The foundation of the Court of the Gentiles is laid, and all the nations of the earth are invited to flow unto it. The faithful bondsmen have enabled England to build a temple to the LORD, unparalleled in the records of the earth : a temple, as far surpassing that of Solomon in all its glory, as an organized intellectual and spiritual can surpass a mere earthly and material fabric.

May the voice of prayer from purified hearts ever arise, like sweet incense, from its hallowed courts ; and may the mercy-seat ever abide in its sanctuary, and may the eyes of all nations be turned towards the one great propitiating sacrifice ever slain upon its altar ! Then shall the river of life flow in healing streams from its sanctuary, and the cloud of the glory of our God shall ever rest upon its pinnacles !

May his Shekinah ever vouchsafe to dwell there, and his holy Urim and Thummim never be lost there !

THE END.